

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE present Archbishop of York wrote some years ago: 'It is often said that our Lord's doctrine is that of free forgiveness on the sole condition of repentance. But there is a condition which we must fulfil if we are to make our own the forgiveness which God always and freely offers. And it is noticeable that repentance is not, in fact, mentioned in this connexion. The one thing that is mentioned, and that with a most solemn reiteration, is our forgiveness of those who have injured us or are in our debt.'

Dr. TEMPLE still regards this aspect of our Lord's doctrine of forgiveness of sins as 'profoundly true' and 'vitally important,' and he affirms it to be 'almost universally neglected.' This appears in his Foreword to a recent book, *The Forgiveness of Sins*, by the Rev. E. Basil Redlich, B.D., Canon Theologian of Leicester (T. & T. Clark; 10s. 6d. net). In this book Canon Redlich gathers together the teaching of the Bible, and especially of the Gospels, on the subject of forgiveness; and the burden of his exposition is that to gain forgiveness from God a man must first forgive his fellow-men.

There is much in this part of the work to interest the Christian expositor (it may be here noted that in following up his main contention the writer passes beyond the Biblical period), and the exposition is for the most part clear and on popular lines. In the second part the emphasis is systematic rather than historical, and here the writer essays a 'rationale of forgiveness.' Whether one agrees always with his analyses in this part, as with his interpretations in the first part, one cannot but be impressed with the

necessity of making more of forgivingness in the presentation of the Christian doctrine of forgiveness.

But Canon Redlich would go further than this and claim primacy for forgivingness over repentance. The first point he would make is that forgivingness is almost universally absent in repentance, as this latter term is understood in Moral Theology, or in Manuals of Confession, or in the Church of England. For example, in the Prayer Book of the Church of England, repentance and the forgiveness of others are required as two distinct and separate conditions in the Exhortation and Invitation of the Communion Office, in the Catechism, and in the Visitation of the Sick. And in this, it must be allowed, the Church of England is in line with the teaching on repentance in the Old Testament and even in the Parable of the Prodigal Son.

The next point he would make is that repentance, understood according to the mind of Christ, cannot really be dissociated from forgivingness but must be accompanied by it. Repentance without forgivingness is not true repentance. Truly experienced repentance must include not only the love of God but also the love of man. Then only is repentance ideal and complete.

The final point is now reached. It is that when we consider the differences between forgivingness and repentance, as the latter is narrowly understood, we must award the primacy to forgivingness. We are invited to consider positions such as the following: (1) Only if he have the forgiving spirit before he makes confession can a sinner prove himself

worthily prepared for the forgiveness of God ; for God is love, and His love is like the sun which shines on the just and the unjust. (2) It is part of the same position that only if he have the forgiving spirit is there a guarantee that selfishness and self-centredness have no place in the heart of the penitent ; and the very nature of the God of love is opposed to selfishness and self-centredness in any form. (3) To forgive another makes greater claims on our spiritual energy than does repentance before God. (4) Repentance and the disposition of penitence relate to acts done by us, but forgivingness is greater, as relating to acts done against us. (5) Forgivingness is a more potent remedy for the ills of the world than repentance.

While one may question the propriety of thus attempting to exalt forgivingness over repentance, as narrowly understood ; while also one may desiderate a more vigorous logical treatment of the distinction in question, one cannot but realize that if the spirit of forgiveness does not take possession of the penitent, then he cannot be in the truly Christian state of forgiveness. Accordingly, we are grateful to Canon Redlich for making this point so emphatically.

The critical state of the world and particularly the trials through which the churches on the Continent have had to pass has led to very profound searchings of heart, and one can discern in continental theologians a note of deeper seriousness, not to say desperate earnestness. The days of the arm-chair critic are gone ; faith is felt to be a matter of life and death, and men are driven back for refuge on the fundamentals. We whose life, both in Church and State, is more peaceful, and who look on the conflict more as spectators than as actors and sufferers, would do well to give heed to those who speak to us out of the midst of the fiery furnace.

These reflections are suggested by the appearance in English of a book by a notable German Lutheran—*The Mystery of God*, by Dr. Wilhelm STÄHLIN

(S.C.M. ; 7s. 6d. net). It has been published under the auspices of the World Conference on Faith and Order, and is to be regarded as a statement of first-rate importance dealing with the Christian revelation as it is embodied in the Word, the Sacraments, and the Church.

The treatment is fresh and powerful, the work of a profound thinker who goes to the root of his subject, and at the same time feels as profoundly as he thinks. Here is a man who manifestly trembles at the Word of God, and his seriousness, quite apart from the weight of his argument, is exceedingly impressive.

His thinking centres round the conception of 'the mystery of God,' of which the Church has received a stewardship. What is that mystery ? It is the action of God in history whereby the Unseen becomes visible and the Eternal is revealed in time.

This mystery is not the pervasive presence of God at all times and in all places. It is revealed in Christ at a definite point of time, like the lightning-flash which strikes one spot of earth, or like the subterranean fire which, while 'secretly at work from the earliest beginning beneath the covering surface of earthly happening, making the earth quake now and again with sinister rumblings and yet in a secret manner bearing and nourishing all life and happening upon earth, breaks forth at one place from out of the primeval deep.'

How is this Divine mystery related to the earthly actuality, and in what manner does it enter into it ? For answer Dr. STÄHLIN makes use of the Lutheran phrase 'in, with, and under.' That phrase was used to express the relation of Christ to the sacrament of the Supper. His body and blood were 'in, with, and under' the bread and wine. The words may be given a far wider application. 'It is of the essence of the mystery that here God Himself, His love, and His power become present in, with, and under an earthly actuality. At no time did the mystery exist in the thin atmosphere of mere thought, detached from a concrete

and sensible happening in the earthly sphere. The Divine mystery is actualized in this very thing, that God unites Himself with an earthly form, and even now invites and obliges us to experience and receive the transcendent mystery in, with, and under a concrete (that is, a definite and limited) physical reality.'

God was 'in' Christ. The Divine mystery is the mystery of the Incarnation. It pleased God to pour the fullness of His wisdom and love into an earthly vessel. 'The Divine mystery does not dwell with those who bear in themselves an insatiable yearning for boundless expanses, preferring the general to the particular, despising the once-only, and scorning the notion that the Lord of Heaven could dwell within the shrine of narrowness and poverty.'

The word 'with' points to an alliance between the heavenly boon and the earthly reality. The Divine majesty is fitly represented as a consuming fire. 'No man shall see me and live.' But it is the mystery of God's mercy that He does not consume the earthly vessel into which He pours His fullness. The deity of Christ does not absorb or consume His humanity. 'Reformation theology fought the medieval doctrine of trans-substantiation, not because it seemed to them to be too miraculous—rationalism was first guilty of this misunderstanding—but because it suspected in that doctrine a rationalistic dissolving of the mystery which was not fair to the inconceivable miracle of the Divine presence in earthly matter.'

The third word in the formula, 'under,' indicates that the Divine mystery, though revealed, remains at the same time in obscurity. 'Jesus Christ Himself, the distinctive content of the mystery, is one form in which the majesty of God is concealed. The Church bears the slave-form of the Cross, and its glory is a hidden glory.' But this hiddenness is not final. Some day the hidden will be made manifest. The mystery is the Divine secret in this interim situation of history, in which it is not yet manifested what we shall be. 'The night is passing away, but it is not yet full daylight. The com-

forting and saving Divine grace is still hidden under the coverings of earthly material. The "under" of the Reformation formula reminds us of the fact that we have the Divine mystery with us as the great hope.'

This Divine mystery is embodied in and expressed through the Church, the Sacraments, and the Word. These subjects are treated in a very arresting way, and with a reverence which makes the reader feel that he is in touch with holy things.

Emeritus Professor G. Dawes Hicks, M.A., Ph.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., has published a useful and interesting book designed primarily for the 'general reader,' namely, his Hibbert Lectures on *The Philosophical Bases of Theism* (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net). It is his contention that the true revelation of God must be sought in the whole process of Nature and human history and in the intellectual, moral, and religious experience of individuals. He follows up this contention with a discussion of the essential meaning of the classical theistic arguments and of the argument from moral values. He also discusses the issue between pantheism and theism.

But he deals particularly with the nature and significance of specifically religious experience, and it is to his treatment of this subject that we would direct attention. It is good to see the classical and standard theistic arguments refurbished and presented afresh, but more vital to present-day theism is the defence of the validity of religious experience.

There has been a marked tendency amongst theological writers of recent times to discountenance the influence of the intellect or the knowing factor in the formation of the religious consciousness. More perhaps than any other, Schleiermacher is responsible for this. At the root of his interpretation of religious experience lay the notion of the Divine immanence in the soul of man. The true nature of religion, he said, is just 'the immediate consciousness of the Deity as He is found in our-

selves and in the world.' More specifically it is 'a feeling of absolute dependence.'

But in using this latter phrase Schleiermacher gave his case away. Mere feeling could not proclaim its own nature. Dependence is discerned by the religious man as the result of a cognitive act. Religious feelings cannot be other than feelings engendered by religious ideas. The phrase 'absolute dependence' must imply a reality, to some extent known, on which to depend.

Schleiermacher frequently employed the term 'feeling' in the way it is now customary to speak of 'immediate' or 'intuitive' experience. But here again we meet with ambiguity. 'Immediate experience' does not contain within itself a 'consciousness of unity with the Eternal.' To live through, to experience, a mental process, and to know that we are living through it, are two very different things. Moreover, perception or apprehension as it takes place in ourselves is an extremely complex process. It may seem to be direct and immediate, yet mediate inference may be present in it.

In his states of ecstasy the mystic is assured that he has an immediate intuition of God. But the mystic is constrained to interpret his experiences even in simply attempting to describe them. And his interpretation implies that, prior to the experience in question, he has acquired his religious beliefs precisely as his non-mystical neighbour acquires his, namely, through instruction and tradition, through habitual ways of thinking, and through rational reflection. In other words, he brings his theological convictions to the mystical experience.

'When, for example, some of the mystics declare that in the stage of what they call "contemplation" they have been able to "see" how God can be three Persons, or in what wise the Virgin Mary had been assumed into heaven, nothing can be more obvious than that they "see" what they have been by training and teaching predisposed to see. Had they been nurtured in the faith of Buddhism or of Taoism their mystic visions would unquestionably have been entirely different.'

It is a grave error to separate feeling or intuition or mystical apprehension or, for that matter, the 'numinous' faculty from knowing. Such a separation, could it ever come about, would mean the extinction of both. As a matter of fact it is not mere feeling that is really meant when it is claimed that feeling is the ultimate root of religious experience. When Tennyson, clinging to his religious assurance, asserted 'I have felt,' he was really opposing to doubt, not mere feeling as such, but his entire personality, including the cognitive and volitional elements.

In religious experience, it should be observed, we do not apprehend the mind of God in a way similar to that in which we apprehend our own mind. However vivid and profound a man's religious experience may be, he can be conscious of God only through the medium of God's manifestations in the universe, including finite minds, and through the emotions thus awakened. 'And every serious and reflective mind amongst us could tell of moments, not indeed of ecstatic exaltation of the mystic type, but of calm rational insight into the spiritual meaning of existence, when he has been conscious of a revelation or filled with an enthusiasm the import of which has been to him infinitely precious, and concerning which he is persuaded it was no phantom of unreality.'

There is much that is eloquent in these pages, and they are illuminated by many a concrete instance. The following quotation may serve to round off this account of the discussion on religious experience: 'Call it reason, call it insight, call it inspiration, whatever it be that enables us thus to grasp the deeper significance of the world without and the world within, it engenders the irresistible conviction that the human knower is not alone in knowing the facts of Nature, that the human heart is not alone in the love it feels, that the human will is not alone in striving for the good which it reveres. And that surely is what we mean by God—a consciousness that knows all that we cannot know, that loves beyond our power of loving, that "realises" the good where our faltering efforts fail.'

The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.

By PROFESSOR W. R. FORRESTER, B.D., ST. ANDREWS.

It is now over thirty years since Max Weber wrote his famous essay on the relations of capitalism to the Protestant Ethic. In those thirty years the subject has become vastly more important, and a large literature has arisen around it, in German, French, and English. Talcott Parsons, in his translation of Weber's Essay, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (Allen & Unwin, 1930, p. 4 f.), gives a short list of some of the more important works and essays dealing with the subject, and the list has grown considerably longer since. We may mention especially in English the translation of Troeltsch's great work, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* (Allen & Unwin, 1931); a brilliant book by Dr. H. M. Robertson, *Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism* (Camb. Univ. Press, 1933); a reply to it by J. Brodrick, S.J., *The Economic Morals of the Jesuits* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1934); and more recent and very important, R. L. Calhoun, *God and the Common Life* (Scribners, 1935); and Fanfani, *Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism* (Sheed & Ward, 1935), the last of which has further bibliographies on pp. 1, 2, 15, and 16. These and other less important treatments show something of the interest aroused by Max Weber's thesis that the 'spirit of capitalism' owes its origin to the Reformation, and especially to its doctrine of 'Vocation' in daily life.

Further, in the last thirty years, the march of events has quickened interest in the relations of our economic system to its spiritual foundations. The Neo-Thomists argue that our present international and economic malaise is the inevitable nemesis of the divisive forces released and produced by the Reformation, and advocate a return to the supposed spiritual unity of the Mediæval system.¹ The Marxists are more than willing to agree that Capitalism has its roots in religious ideas—it is not a natural growth, but 'a crass construction of the Calvinist mind'—and therefore they condemn its ideology as based on illusion. For Max Weber's thesis reverses what Marxian 'realists' maintain to be the order of events, by which economic forces and pressures produce social and religious ideas and institutions, instead of the other way round.²

¹ See, e.g., Christopher Dawson and Fanfani, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

² To Marx Protestantism is 'essentially a bourgeois religion,' *Das Kapital*, i. ch. 27.

Another school of thought, led by Reinhold Niebuhr in America and by Macmurray in this country, claims that the Kingdom of God can come only by some synthesis between Communism and Christianity. If we agree with Tawney that Weber's thesis means that 'Capitalism was the social counterpart of Calvinist theology,'³ then those who believe that Capitalism has led us to disaster maintain that Protestantism is doomed with the decay of its inevitable sociological and economic embodiment. They point to the helplessness of the modern world in face of unemployment and nationalism, and foretell the speedy end of the Reformation era.⁴ From both sides Protestantism is assailed, and both parties make use of the Weber thesis. The Communists arraign the Reformation because in producing Capitalism it reversed the true order of history according to Karl Marx; and the Romanists, because it is responsible for the present 'anarchy' in economics and international relationships, and for the prevailing materialism and secularism. It is therefore most necessary to subject Weber's thesis to analysis, all the more because the doctrine of vocation is bound to become more and more prominent in the near future both in ethics and in theology.

Vocation is one of the dominating themes of both Old and New Testaments, yet the word 'Vocation' occurs only once in the whole Authorized Version, in Eph 4¹, 'I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.' But the word 'Atonement' also occurs only once in the New Testament (A.V.), and we need not be alarmed in either case at the rarity of the word for an important doctrine. In the case of 'Vocation' its modern meaning is post-Reformation, a significant fact. The noun 'call' does not occur at all in its theological significance in A.V., and 'calling' only twice, except in St. Paul. Turning from words to ideas, we find the Old Testament is the Book of the Vocation of Israel; the whole idea of the Covenant

³ Foreword to Weber's *The Protestant Ethic* (Eng. tr.), 2.

⁴ Fanfani, after declaring repeatedly that 'the Catholic ethos is anti-capitalistic' (pp. 143, 149, 151, 153, 159), claims that Catholicism is 'looking forward to the time when it (capitalism) should give place to a corporative organization of society' (*op. cit.*, 142, 159).

and the Chosen People is a doctrine of vocation, whose special feature is the personal and gracious relationship between Jehovah and each member of His people, as well as a promise for the people as a whole. This we see best in the case of Abraham, which is singled out both in Is 51² and in He 11⁸⁻¹⁸, to show the relation between the calling of God and the response of faith. In the New Testament this thought is continued, though transformed, in the doctrine of the Ecclesia, which is the company of 'the called of God' (κλησις, ἐκκλησία, ἐκκληστοί).

It is possible to distinguish three senses in which the idea of vocation occurs in Scripture: (1) the 'general' call to salvation. In this sense Israel was 'called,' and in the New Testament Paul addresses the little groups of converts as 'called to be saints' (Ro 1⁷ etc.). This is the 'heavenly calling' of He 3¹.

(2) A special commission or charge given to certain individuals, such as the prophets in the Old Testament, though others too might be 'called.' In the New Testament, Paul emphatically claims this special commission for himself as an Apostle (Ro 1¹ etc.), but this 'call' was not confined to the Apostles. Jesus' whole life is a study in vocation, and vocation is the principle on which rests the doctrine of the Christian conscience, and the articulation and organization of the Body of Christ, especially in Eph 4.

(3) The third sense is our special subject here, the doctrine of vocation as the 'earthly calling,' which is the counterpart of the 'heavenly calling.' It means treating our daily work as a mission from God, and the *locus classicus* for it is 1 Co 7¹⁷⁻²⁸, 'As the Lord hath called every man, so let him walk . . .' Here, again, it seems that an elaborate doctrine has been founded on very slender scriptural foundations. Karl Holl¹ remarks that we do not know enough about the language usages of the time to decide whether Paul was coining a new thought altogether unique in the history of religion, or whether he was making use of some current idea. But Kirk² is quite emphatic, 'The words "call" and "calling" here obviously have two meanings. There is the "call" to be a Christian, and the "calling" (as we say) or worldly avocation,³ already being followed when the call to Christianity comes. . . . Quite deliberately he places these secular conditions and circumstances—this profession or status in which a man happens to be at the time of his conversion—on the same spiritual level as that conversion itself.

Each is a "call" or "calling" direct from God. To express this the apostle is forced to use the Greek work *klēsis* in an entirely new sense; for no strict parallel to the use of "calling" for secular "avocation"—a usage so familiar to us in modern English—can be found in contemporary literature. The inference is as amazing as it is inevitable . . . it is to him we owe the great Christian truth that the most ordinary and secular employment can and should be regarded as a mission directly laid upon us by the Omnipotent God Himself.'

Again, we need not be alarmed that this great doctrine should apparently have such slender foundations in Scripture, for Paul in this passage is only emphasizing and formulating the principle of stewardship which is the recurrent theme of many of the Parables. The stranger thing is the fact that this doctrine once expressed was apparently never grasped by any one, and was forgotten or neglected till the Reformation.

Holl and Troeltsch both explain this neglect in the same way, and most conclusively. The Church in its early days was more concerned with missionary expansion than with any ethical principle or social programme. And by the time the *Parousia* expectation was fading, the catholicizing movement was already well on its way. In becoming acclimatized to the Greek culture, the Church began to exalt the contemplative above the practical life, and with the rise of monasticism the 'absolute' ethic of renunciation and seclusion was accounted more Christian than the 'relative' ethic of those who remained 'in the world.' The religious vocation' was the special call to be a monk, a nun, or a priest, sworn to celibacy, poverty, and rigorous discipline. According to the current interpretation of Mt 19¹⁶⁻²⁶ there were two standards of life—the higher of 'perfection' and 'treasure in heaven,' involving renunciation of 'the world'; the lower, enabling a man to 'enter into life,' required only the keeping of the Commandments. This double standard devitalized religion and robbed the world of affairs of its true spiritual importance. It created a distinction between sacred and secular, which Kirk says 'saved Christianity,'⁴ but at a terrible price. The difference, at first treated as one of degree, soon hardened into one of kind, and the result has been twofold: (1) Romanism since has never had a satisfactory doctrine of 'secular vocation';⁵ and (2) the power of the priesthood over the layman, the latter being debarred from the fullest spiritual life and compelled to live in daily

¹ *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, 190.

² *The Vision of God* (abridged), 39, 40.

³ Observe use of 'avocation' here. See N.E.D.

⁴ See *The Vision of God* (abridged), 103-112.

⁵ Cf. Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 204.

compromising contact with 'the world,' lacking a sense of vocation and therefore without full assurance of his own salvation. The 'religious vocation' remains in Roman phraseology the prerogative and privilege of the priest, the monk, and the nun.

It is not strictly true to say that the doctrine of secular vocation was entirely 'an achievement of the Reformation.'¹ Troeltsch proves the contrary, and Holl and others have shown how in the Mystics and in Aquinas, so far as theory went, and in the Guilds in practice, the later Middle Ages were struggling to express the idea.² But the doctrine of the two standards prevented its full development, and it was only when Luther revived the doctrine of the spiritual priesthood of all believers that a true and complete doctrine of 'secular vocation' became possible.³ Indeed, the doctrine of secular vocation is the necessary counterpart of the doctrine of the spiritual priesthood of all believers, as it is also of the doctrine of election itself.

Luther's use of words in his translation of the Bible is most interesting and important in this connexion, but a discussion of it would be too technical.⁴ The main point for our purpose is, that Luther deposed the monk from his former position as the ideal of a Christian man, and put the good householder in his place, thus changing the whole emphasis of Christian Ethics, and giving a new start to the history of Europe. 'Neither the predominantly Catholic peoples nor those of classical antiquity have possessed any expression of similar connotation for what we know as a calling (in the sense of a life-task, a definite field in which to work), while one has existed for all predominantly Protestant peoples. . . . In its modern meaning the word (*Beruf*=calling) comes from the Bible translations, through the spirit of the translator, not that of the original. . . . After that it speedily took on its present meaning in the everyday speech of all Protestant peoples, while earlier not even a suggestion of such a meaning could be found in the secular literature of any of them, and even, in religious writings, so far as I can ascertain, it is only found in one of the German mystics whose influence

on Luther is well known. Like the meaning of the word, the idea is new, a product of the Reformation.'⁵ (With this, of course, we do not altogether agree.)

Luther 'refuses to make that sharp distinction between sacred and secular so characteristic of the Latin world.'⁶ It is easy to see how the 'little monk,' defying the powers of Church and State, and appealing to the Word of God and his own conscience, ushered in a new era in all matters of faith, conduct, and the community. It is not easy to see how the great achievements of modern industrialism could have been gained by men accustomed to make use of the confessional, not because the habit of confession would have checked the abuses of modern industry, but because it was the sturdy self-reliance bred and encouraged by the Protestant type of faith and character that made both the achievements and the abuses possible. To this day the Roman Church and the countries it dominates have stood aloof from, and been somewhat suspicious of, the strenuous industrial activities of the more progressive and therefore more prosperous Protestant countries. This is no accident, nor is it to be explained by the absence of mineral resources, or considerations of climate and national characteristics. The command of man over Nature, in science and industry, has been largely due to the new emphasis thrown by the Reformers upon the practical and 'secular' alongside the contemplative and 'sacred' aspects of the spiritual life.⁷

But a further distinction has to be drawn. Luther, especially after the outbreak of the Peasants' War, was socially and economically a conservative. Like Calvin and Melancthon he disliked commerce intensely, and he tried to make the changes he was forced to make as little revolutionary as possible. He was also desperately afraid of any conception which might revive ideas of merit to the detriment of justification by faith alone. So the Lutheran interpretation of 1 Co 7 is quietistic, emphasizing the duty of passive obedience, the negative side of vocation rather than the positive, abiding in one's calling rather than exerting oneself

⁵ Weber, 79 f.; but cf. Fanfani, *passim*.

¹ Naumann in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (R.G.G.), i. 1061.

² Troeltsch, *Social Teaching in the Christian Churches*, i. 292, etc.; cf. Calhoun, *God and the Common Life*, 254. Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 201 and 160:—'No one now denies that it (the advent of capitalism) took place before the Reformation and among Catholics.'

³ See Calhoun, *op. cit.*, 254.

⁴ See Weber, 79, 204-211, and Holl, *op. cit.*, 213-219.

⁶ Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, 59. 'The obligation to "be perfect" rested upon every believer, in every sort of earthly calling.' Calhoun, *op. cit.*, 50.

⁷ Cf. Fanfani: 'These facts (of Protestant thrift and enterprise) are perfectly true, but are in no way connected with the religion of the social groups concerned' (*op. cit.*, 186). See also p. 210, 'the main explanation must lie with circumstances extraneous to the religious phenomenon.'

in it. Troeltsch has made a special study of the contrast between the 'social impotence of Lutheranism,'¹ with its strong leanings towards mediævalism, and the radical 'active character of Calvinism . . . its capacity to penetrate the political and economic movements of Western nations with its religious ideal, a capacity which Lutheranism lacked from the very beginning.'² For better or for worse, the Calvinist emphasis upon predestination has sent men out into their daily work with the sense of being the agents of Omnipotence, to make trial of their election by stern devotion to duty. Success in a man's secular vocation is too often wrongly considered as a confirmation of his election. Too often, also, prosperity and wealth have been treated as an index of a man's true worth or a nation's standing in the sight of God. Calvinism did not hold aloof from affairs as Romanism and even Lutheranism did, but accepted 'business' as the appointed sphere for the testing and strengthening of souls. Ambition was consecrated by obtaining a religious sanction, and became a worthy motive by being sublimated into a sense of vocation, and many of the best and some of the worst things of our modern life are the result. For sometimes the 'sublimation' has been little better than a disguise.³

Troeltsch and Tawney have developed Weber's thesis, tracing the influence of the sense of vocation through the later developments of Protestantism and the rise of Capitalism. In particular, they have emphasized the way in which Puritanism in this country has been largely responsible for our industrial development, for it has sent men wholeheartedly into affairs with an ascetic assiduity and concentration, and made them 'religious in it,' spare-living, hard-thinking, straight-dealing, giving 'the more diligence to make their calling and election sure' (2 P 1¹⁰). The facts are indisputable, but they claim they can also observe a change in the character of Calvinism, as its close relationship with the world of business reacted upon its own spiritual life, very much as after Constantine the relationship with the State transformed and 'naturalized' the Church.⁴ Troeltsch especially

draws attention to the difference between the attitude of Calvin himself and early Calvinism, and the later attitude of Neo-Calvinism to business life.⁵ Calhoun blames the Reformation for having 'no coherent and realistic insight into the connexion between ethical ideals and economic facts.'⁶ Further, while the revolt against Indulgences was a symptom of a new ethical attitude, which dealt with the individual as a whole as the moral unit, and refused to treat his separate actions as isolated assessable moral atoms, the moral gain in this was counterbalanced by the excessive individualism of the new teaching, in both faith and conscience. 'In Protestant theory the central concept of predestination, the direct, secret, arbitrary calling by God of the elect, one by one, leads to an anti-organic conception of the individual's relation to society. . . . In strict theory work in one's earthly vocation is not primarily for the sake of contributing to the common life . . . (it) is primarily a way of expressing obedience to God, and secondarily of discovering to oneself and to others evidences of God's favour—that is, of one's enrolment among the elect—according as one's diligence issues in prosperous and tranquil life.'⁷ While we must not exaggerate either the supposed unity of Church and State in the Middle Ages, or the supposed divisive sectarianism of Protestantism, we must admit that certain of the individualistic tendencies of our modern social and economic life gain at least the colour of an excuse from the severe loneliness of the soul with God which was at once the strength and the weakness of Protestantism, in spite of the emphasis laid by the Reformers on the Church.

But it is quite another thing to jump to the conclusion that Capitalism with all its vices is the acknowledged and only legitimate child of the Reformation. 'The Reformers read their Old Testament, and trying to imitate the Jews, became those detestable Puritans to whom we owe, not merely Grundyism and Podsnappery, but also (as Weber and Tawney have shown) all that was and still is vilest, cruellest, most anti-human in the modern capitalist system' (Aldous Huxley). It is hard to find a statement where prejudice leads to a conclusion more unwarrantable. Yet it may lead us to an important distinction too often neglected, namely, that between *industrialism* and *capitalism*. Max Weber points out that 'the *auri sacra fames* is as old as the history of man,'⁸ but though the

¹ *Social Teaching*, ii. 563.

² *Ib.*, 577. 'It was Calvin who finally destroyed the last vestiges of mediævalism by justifying interest' (R. Niebuhr, *Does Civilization need Religion?* 94).

³ 'Its sanction of secular tasks led inevitably to a sanction of secular motives which it did not desire and could not prevent' (R. Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, 102).

⁴ But Fanfani maintains this development was normal and inevitable, the logical outcome of Protestantism, not a perversion of it (*op. cit.*, 199).

⁵ *Social Teaching*, 576, etc.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, 49.

⁷ Calhoun, *op. cit.*, 46-47; cf. Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 149, for the Roman view.

⁸ *Protestant Ethic*, 57.

'spirit of capitalism' was present in germ, it could not develop until the industrial age brought into being a *system* to embody and promote that *spirit*.¹ So, too, H. M. Robertson: 'We have lived in an acquisitive society for some thousands of years.'² Aristotle deals with it in Book I. of the *Politics*, and Robertson, following Sombart, and Tawney in chapter i. of *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, have shown how prevalent the 'spirit of capitalism' was before the Reformation, and how the Church fought in vain to restrain avarice and regulate 'usury.' Though Brodrick in his brilliant piece of polemic³ has caught Robertson out on a number of matters of detail, he has left his central thesis unassailed, because it is true and unassailable. The rise of the 'capitalistic spirit' can be traced back far before the Reformation, and first the Roman Church and afterwards both Romans and Protestants tried in vain to curb it, and to discover ethical principles which would apply to the rapidly developing commercial and industrial life of the new age.⁴ The early Reformers were no more favourable to 'usury' than the Catholics were. Robertson has shown the desperate expedients of those who relied on the confessional to give guidance and prevent

¹ Capitalism, according to Lemoine, 'does not exist till it constitutes an "entire régime,"' quoted by Fanfani, p. 19.

² *Op. cit.*, 35. ³ *The Economic Morals of the Jesuits*.

⁴ Fanfani devotes much time to disproving the responsibility of Catholicism for the development of capitalism. He makes a subtle and acute distinction between the influence of religion as a doctrinal system and its influence as an organization on life in general and economic life in particular. But he altogether fails to observe how this distinction has as its counterpart the corresponding one on the other side between *capitalism* and *industrialism*. 'The relations between capitalism and the Catholic religion must not be confused with the relations between capitalism and the Catholic Church as an organization' (*op. cit.*, 3). His chapter v. is a defence against the charge (made by Sombart, Robertson, and others) that 'Catholic ethics have contributed to the formation of the bourgeois mentality' (*op. cit.*, 149). But what interests us more is the inability of Catholicism to influence, promote, restrain, or give moral guidance to industrialism as an inevitable economic tendency, and Fanfani does not give us much help on this. When he says that the ethic of Catholicism is anti-capitalistic, does he mean anti-industrial? or would he go so far as to admit that Catholicism in attempting to restrain *capitalism* in the ethical interest has discouraged *industrialism* in all its forms? 'The principles on which mediæval Catholicism based its antipathy to commerce have been in part maintained, in part abandoned' (p. 133).

abuses, and their failure to deal with the new situation. Tawney has described the struggle and failure of the Protestant divines to legislate for the new circumstances and problems, till Baxter's *Directory* practically marks the end of Protestant casuistry, in this country at any rate. 'Capitalism' was not produced either by Catholicism or by Protestantism. Both tried to suppress its earlier phases, and both failed. But Protestantism could not withdraw from the conflict, as Romanism did, for Protestantism made modern industrialism possible, while Romanism did not. It is a complete mistake to maintain that Protestantism produced capitalism, changed the sin of avarice into the virtue of consecrated industry, and then failed to control or discipline the tremendous and ruthless power it had itself produced, till that power became completely anti-social and anti-religious, and the legacy of the 'detestable Puritans' has ruined us all. Capitalism is much older even than the Pharaohs, it is as old as selfishness, which is as old as sin. Its growth in the modern age is due to economic factors for which religion in no form is directly or indirectly responsible. Is any one prepared to condemn *industrialism*, root and branch, the whole process by which men have advanced from a kind of life which was 'poor, nasty, brutish, and short,' to a stage of culture and civilization in which the standard of decency and humanity has been raised so much higher, man's power over Nature has been achieved, and the possibilities of life, moral as well as material, have been infinitely extended? Are we prepared to condemn nationalism and all its works, because of its abuse by unscrupulous would-be Cæsars? Or to sweep away the whole of modern science, because it has produced poison gas? Industrialism is one thing, and capitalism far from being the same thing. But we need not even condemn capitalism unheard, as being in essence and actuality mere embodied avarice. 'It is noteworthy,' says Robertson,⁵ 'that the writings of the religio-sociological school on the origins of the capitalist spirit are infected with a deep hatred of capitalism.' If capitalism is 'a Moloch of Calvinist selfishness,' then Weber and Tawney are the allies of Marx in their attack on capitalism; and incidentally all three lend colour to the suspicion that Protestantism after all is the root evil of our modern age, and capitalism only the inevitable nemesis of the Reformation.⁶ We

⁵ *Op. cit.*, 207.

⁶ Indeed, to some it has become a modern substitute for the devil, as a demonic power responsible for all evil.

might with almost equal justification maintain, that because Aristotle was the tutor of Alexander, he was responsible for his pupil's megalomania; and because Seneca was the tutor of Nero, Stoicism was responsible for the burning of Rome; and generalizing, a philosophic upbringing leads in later life to an ungovernable temper!

Many factors were responsible for the rise of industrialism, and for its excessive individualism, and among them were some purely economic, and apparently inevitable; but also there is no doubt that the spirit of integrity and diligence, typical of those who believed their conduct in business a matter of moment to God, created the credit and the enterprise necessary for modern business ventures. There is nothing to be ashamed of in this. That these often degenerated into exploitation and speculation is no fault of religion, but of human nature and original sin. In this sense both capitalism and nationalism are by-products of the Reformation, but we have no real cause to be ashamed of the relationship between Protestantism and the great developments of the last four hundred years in politics, in industry, in science and philosophy. Admittedly in all these spheres unforeseen evils have arisen, and problems still exist which meantime defy solution, some of them due to the Renaissance more than to the Reformation; for the modern age has not yet learned to reconcile these two great formative influences. Meantime, Luther and Calvin are blamed for sins that should be laid at the door of Machiavelli and Humanism in general. If there had been no Reformation many of these problems *might* never have arisen, as a ship that lies in harbour cannot run upon the rocks. As Fanfani sees clearly, it is the assertion of the moral autonomy of the individual conscience, due to the Reformation, that is responsible for much that is worst in our modern social life. But it is also responsible for the best. Even the present ills of society will surely not persuade us to renounce that autonomy, to which we owe the greatest achievements, political, economic, scientific, and religious, of the Reformation era, and to attempt to 'arrest the trend towards autonomy of morals.'¹

'Catholicism cannot recognize certain liberties in the absence of which capitalism becomes transformed or dies.'² So Fanfani maintains it is equally opposed to parliamentary government, which is the political counterpart of capitalism, and to communism, which he treats as merely the climax of capitalism. Does Fanfani herald the advent of the corporative state as the means by

which the Catholic ideal will transform a capitalist society into a truly ethical and Christian one?³ It is quite true that the same qualities of character that made Protestantism take the lead in industrial and commercial development have made the Protestant countries the pioneers also in constitutional government. Here, again, we can admit a close relationship between Protestantism, *industrialism*, and political democracy, without being obliged to admit that either Protestantism or democracy stands or falls with *capitalism* in its present form. On the contrary, it is the conflict between political democracy and industrial autocracy in the modern community that is leading certain countries towards the development of democracy in industry, and certain others towards autocracy in politics. Fanfani maintains that the rise of capitalism was due in the first instance to a waning of faith (in the Catholic sense);⁴ that capitalism was responsible for the creation of parliamentary government, as the best political means of furthering commercial enterprise; and now the decay of liberalism in the political sense is one symptom of the passing of the capitalistic era, whose political institutions reflect the economic needs and aims that create them. Apparently he regards the corporative state as the means by which the 'capitalist spirit' is to be exorcised, industrialism ethicized, and the divisive tendencies of political democracy to be transcended in a type of community where authority imposes a social conception of wealth in the interests of 'the supernatural ends of the individual,' and 'arrests the trend towards autonomy of morals,' which is to him the characteristic of the Protestant capitalistic era. Here we see how far apart Niebuhr and Macmurray are from neo-Thomists like Fanfani. To the former, capitalism and political democracy are incompatible. To the latter, they stand or fall together. But even those who are prepared to contemplate the passing of capitalism with comparative equanimity may well be alarmed at the prospect that it may carry with it the political institutions in which in this country at any rate our ideals of liberty, justice, and progress are more or less adequately embodied. But here again our distinction between *industrialism* and *capitalism* shows us the fallacy involved. Our political institutions *are* those of an industrialized civilization, influenced by its present phase of capitalism, but capable of adjustment as the economic needs and tendencies of the times may require, and also capable of directing those tendencies towards

¹ *Op. cit.*, 144.

² *Ib.*, 142.

³ Ch. 4.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 178.

desirable social ends and restraining them from anti-social expressions. Unless we blindly accept Marxian economic determinism, we are bound by a dispassionate observation of history to admit both the moulding of our political and ecclesiastical institutions by economic pressures, and the equally obvious moulding of these economic tendencies by political and religious ideals.

Vocation is the 'sublimation' of that instinctive and ineradicable 'conatus in suo esse perseverare,' which, lacking sublimation, becomes perverted into ambition. Calvinism has been the only type of the Christian religion to attempt to apply this principle thoroughly and constructively to men's daily life. It has not been wholly successful either socially or with the individual. 'The radical sects did challenge the existing structure of society, but their strategy in dealing with it was usually based either on apocalypticism or asceticism. The Quakers were an exception. It remained for Calvinism to develop a world-changing ethic and then to put its stamp of approval on the new world structure which came with modern capitalism. In effect *Calvinism allowed its own ethic to crystallize around the institutions of capitalism very much as the ethic of the mediæval church was crystallized around the institutions of feudalism.*'¹ It would have been strange if the varying fortunes of four hundred years had not revealed some imperfections in the beliefs and plans of the Reformers, and produced some new aberrations as well. Neither the Church nor the State is yet organized as a 'cosmos of callings' as that ideal is set before us in Eph 4. As Troeltsch in particular has shown, Calvin is one thing and Calvinism another thing; and as for capitalism, its form to-day is very different from that of ten, twenty, or thirty years ago. Far from Protestantism being doomed to pass with the transformation of capitalism into something new and strange, it is itself the strongest influence making for that trans-

formation into something with more resemblance to the Kingdom of God.

Sovietism has tried to dissociate industrialism both from capitalism and from religion, with what success is not yet clearly to be seen, but there are not wanting in Russia signs of a change of mind, both economic and spiritual, as it becomes more and more apparent that only religion can create the pure-minded, unselfish devotion of many to a common cause, that is even more necessary to communism than to any other type of social organization. There are not wanting, too, among the neo-Thomists, those who discern in Aquinas the germs of a doctrine of vocation on which the Roman Church may build something to rule and guide the tendencies of the times.² And for us Protestants, confronted with such engrossing problems as unemployment and nationalism, it becomes more than ever urgent, not to abandon this doctrine of vocation, but to think it through, to detect those counterfeits of it that are merely ambition in disguise, to study carefully its various perversions as they unfold themselves in history and before our eyes. For a sense of vocation, in a man or in a nation, may be a most dangerous thing, — *corruptio optimi pessima*. A man who believes himself the man of destiny may become almost irresistible, a nation that believes itself to have a civilizing mission or a gospel of Kultur may wade through blood to found an empire. As we explore the international, industrial, ecclesiastical, and personal implications of this doctrine of vocation, it must be under the shadow of the Cross, to protect us from taking the name of God in vain, and attempting to disguise the creations of our own vanity and selfishness as the will and purpose of God. As regards the direct responsibility of the Reformation for the infirmities of our times, we must not rest content with a canny Scots 'not proven,' but press for the full and unconditional verdict 'not guilty.' The accusation has failed.

² Fanfani, *op. cit.*, 204, and the Encyclicals *Rerum Novarum* (Leo XIII.) and *Quadragesimo Anno* (Pius XI.).

¹ J. C. Bennett, *Social Salvation*, 106 (Italics mine).

The Problem of Our Lord's Knowledge.

BY THE REVEREND NORMAN HOOK, M.A., THE VICARAGE, KNUTSFORD, CHESHIRE.

CONSTANTLY in the New Testament we meet with categories of thought which belong strictly to the first century, but which appear to have significance for us no longer. Examples of this are the doctrine of demon-possession as an explanation of disease, and the idea of angelic ministries as a fact in spiritual experience. And whilst no one will wish to claim omniscience by denying that angels or demons exist, yet the fact remains that neither have any longer any place in our minds as an explanation of events. How then are we to interpret these New Testament phenomena, and what are we to say in regard to the fact that Christ appeared to believe both in angels and in demons? We know as a matter of history that the doctrine of angelic ministries crept into Hebraism through Zoroastrianism, and was welcomed because it provided a useful bridge between the felt need for Immanence and the current stress upon Transcendence. Does our Lord's acceptance of angelology set the seal of Divine approval upon this importation, or is it permissible to suggest that His knowledge was such as to provide for no guarantee on such matters? If we admit that He might have been mistaken on a matter of this kind, what would be the implications of such an admission upon faith?

The answer to these questions demands a brief inquiry into the meaning of the idea of Incarnation. Notions of dissimulation or reserve on our Lord's part in reference to these matters are to be summarily rejected, on the ground that they are repugnant to His obvious intellectual sincerity, no less than destructive to any satisfying belief in His real humanity.

(1) The Gospels reveal to us that Christ was really a man, sharing with us the characteristic limitations of humanity. He admits there are some things He does not know. He expresses surprise, implying that His expectation was otherwise. Whatever else He was, there is no getting away from the fact that in the Gospels He is portrayed as an individual man. And yet those same Gospels present us with material which would appear to be new to our knowledge of human nature. He is portrayed as sinless, and this remarkable phenomenon seems to fit Him naturally. As such He enjoys a full and uninterrupted communion with God. It is in respect of these two facts, namely, His sinlessness, and His perfect communion

with God, that His knowledge is differentiated from that of other men. Inasmuch as the Incarnation is a unique occurrence, we cannot say how such facts would influence knowledge, but it may be reasonably assumed that they would give Him as sure and as perfect a knowledge both of man and of God as is possible to a human consciousness. They would not, on the other hand, give Him an infallible knowledge of modern science, for that would be no part of a genuine human consciousness. The suggestion that He had an immediate and certain knowledge of God and of man is one to which the records bear witness. If it is 'the pure in heart' who 'see God,' then Jesus must have seen Him very clearly. We are told that 'He knew what was in man,' and His judgments find remarkable confirmation in modern psychology. It is indisputable that these phenomena differentiate Him from other men, and they have given rise to such statements as 'Jesus was a man, but He was more than a man.' But if this means anything at all it must not rob Him of His real humanity. It is not enough that Jesus should be like a man, or in the form of a man; we must insist that He really was a man.

(2) On the other hand, the facts connected with Him led the Church to believe in Incarnation. It is to be noticed that the belief is Incarnation and not Immanence. Immanence might give us a perfection of the Prophetic attributes, but not the perfect knowledge of God and man which we find in Christ. This is completely unique, and the idea of Incarnation is an assertion that it can only be explained as coming from above. It cannot be explained as any result of human progress, as though Jesus was the product of creative evolution, for there is an element of finality about Him, and it is inconceivable that there could ever be one greater than He. Of course, in the nature of the case this is a statement incapable of proof; but its validity is partially demonstrated at least by the complete satisfaction which Jesus affords to our spiritual needs. If the evolutionary hypothesis is employed at all it is preferable to speak of 'emergent' rather than of 'creative' evolution. This states the fact without attempting to explain it, whereas 'creative' evolution suggests that Jesus is the product of the process itself. To say that 'Jesus emerged' does not debar the transcendent element for which the idea of Incarnation stands.

The emergent theory suggests that at certain stages of development, when a high degree of complexity has been reached, new qualities of existence come into being, which cannot be accounted for by the previously existing conditions, and could never have been predicted, even by one who was familiar with the situation. To apply this theory to Jesus is to separate Him from the rest of men without denying that He belongs to them, and it leaves room for that transcendent element which is so jealously guarded in the Church's doctrine of the Incarnation. The uniqueness of Jesus was the perfection of His moral and spiritual nature, and no theory of His Person is adequate which does not do justice to this. It is doubtful how far Kenotic theories can help us. All such theories involve serious speculative problems, and most theologians feel nowadays that an approach should be made on other lines. And yet it is the merit of the Kenotic theories that they begin with the thought of God, and suggest that Christ was in some sense God living the life of man, and not merely a man in whom the Spirit of God tabernacled as in no other. Can the theory of Emergent Evolution do more justice to the facts than the Kenotic theories? Its virtue is that whilst it does not offer an explanation it does include all the facts.

Let us apply it to the mystery of human personality. We may say that a human being is a complex of body, mind, and spirit. The 'centre' of personality is what we call the spirit, and herein lies the principle of individuation. It is my spirit which makes me the particular personality I am and differentiates me from others. Now the spirit of a man is something which 'emerges' within him, either at his birth or possibly at that stage of his existence when for the first time he becomes a self-conscious being. This does not explain personality but merely states the facts. Now the personality of Christ is likewise a complex of body, mind, and spirit, but the spirit which 'emerged' in Him was the Eternal Logos functioning through a human medium and conditioned by it. This is conceivable on the lines of the 'Enhypostasia' of Leontius of Byzantium, and the result, as we might expect, is the emergence of the perfect man. This theory, whilst making the Godhead central, preserves a genuine humanity.

(3) Moreover it fits in with the facts of the gospel. These documents make it clear that Christ grew to a consciousness of His unique vocation and identity. This is what we should expect of a genuinely human experience. Any teaching which suggests that Christ was conscious from the be-

ginning of His pre-existence as the Logos, cannot be reconciled with a genuine human experience. The fact that He grew to such a consciousness is evidence that His knowledge was humanly conditioned. But, on the other hand, He could never have grown to this consciousness had there not been something in His nature to which He could grow. It is because the Logos was the 'centre' of His personality that He could grow to a consciousness of His true destiny. And this same fact explains also why He could reveal God, and why this revelation is to be regarded as humanly perfect and final. Further, the perfection of His manhood explains why He might be expected to know 'what was in man.' In other words, we may assert that His knowledge in the moral and spiritual spheres was perfect and infallible, or as perfect and infallible as a human knowledge can be. This, in fact, was just the impression which He made upon the people of His day. 'He spoke with authority and not as the Scribes and Pharisees.'

But the authority was limited to what appertained to knowledge of God and man. Moreover, even this was humanly conditioned. The date of the end of the world, for example, would not come within the scope of a humanly conditioned knowledge; nor would the authorship of the 110th Psalm, seeing that the Davidic authorship was unquestioned in that day; nor would foreknowledge of modern scientific theories. But what about belief in demons as the cause of disease, or of His approval of the current belief in angelic ministries? The difficulty is to decide whether such beliefs properly come within the sphere of His knowledge of God and of man. It may be argued that they do, in which case we must believe both in demons and in angels. On the other hand we might argue that neither of these beliefs is vital to religion and morality, and that in regard to them our Lord's knowledge was limited by the thought-forms of His day. Neither argument could claim infallibility, for no one can say precisely what would come within the sphere of a perfect knowledge of God and man, and what would not, for the phenomenon is unique and isolated. But plainly we must draw a distinction between ignorance which is irrelevant to His mission and ignorance or positive error which has a direct bearing upon it. If it could be shown that He was under the influence of illusions in regard to angels and demons which must have affected His conception of God and righteousness, the position would become critical, for it would no longer be possible to regard Him as an infallible teacher on faith and morals.

But it will be generally agreed that such beliefs belong to the *accidentia* rather than to the *essentia* of faith, and therefore to hold that they belong strictly to the thought-forms of the day will not weaken faith in the Incarnation. The problem of our Lord's acceptance of the current apocalyptic teaching is much more complex, and reference may be made to a noteworthy contribution by the present Dean of St. Paul's in his *Essays in Construction*.¹ Here again the test is, does our Lord's

¹ Essay No. xi, 'Was Jesus Mistaken?'

acceptance of a particular thought-form introduce an illusion which affects the whole of His teaching?

In the case of Apocalyptic, Schweitzer argued that it did. Dr. Matthews concludes otherwise. But in any case there is no evading this test if we are to stand by the real humanity of Christ. Much work still remains to be done on these lines, and particularly in a day when much teaching which passes for orthodox is still infected with the heresy of Apollinaris and does not really conceive our Lord's consciousness as truly human.

Literature.

A RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY.

EMERITUS-PROFESSOR W. G. DE BURGH, whose volume on 'The Legacy of the Ancient World' was received with such an unusually unanimous chorus of approbation, has given us a notable book on a totally different subject—*Towards a Religious Philosophy* (Macdonald & Evans; 10s. net). The learned author explains that the title of the volume is to be taken quite literally; he is not writing a philosophy of religion, but a group of essays that may serve to point the way to a religious philosophy—'a speculative outlook upon the world and life, which as philosophy must be grounded on reason, and as religion must be centred in God.' He begins with a discussion of the meaning of reason, logic and faith, and illustrates how logic and faith are partners. He goes on to deal with metaphysical and religious knowledge, and the idea of a religious philosophy the case for which is established by the witness of religion to its own coherence. Then we have discussions of various theories of Divine immanence. Next, a singularly impressive chapter on the 'Time-process, eternity, and God.' Here it is argued that Time, viewed in the abstract, implies a non-temporal activity; that the course of events in Time implies a directive activity, not part of the evolutionary process; and that man's intellectual and moral nature imply objective standards of truth and goodness which transcend Time. Impressive, too, are the next two chapters, which deal with God and the world-order and the value of the so-called theistic proofs. Many will probably find the last chapters, which deal with morality and humanism, most impressive and most practically

serviceable. The argument here is against secular humanism and in favour of what is termed 'theocentric humanism.' No minister who deals with the moral problems of youth should miss the excellent discussion, based on wide knowledge, of the moral outlook prevalent among contemporary youth. Such in outline are the contents of this volume.

The author's position in general is to suspect very gravely the 'menace of unreason' in the modern world, in theology as well as in life. Like other thinkers he believes that the path of sanity and safety lies in a return to the spirit and method of St. Thomas. In great part we are in agreement. Our criticism is that in a work dealing with reason and revelation, as this so often does, it is to fail to do justice to the subject to dismiss Barth with a single condemnatory sentence, and not mention Brunner at all. We may agree with them or violently disagree. What is certain is that they cannot be ignored.

While we make this criticism we cordially welcome this distinguished work, not less for the crystal clarity of its style than for the acuteness and massiveness of its thought.

A DEFENCE OF MYSTICISM.

It is refreshing in these days of Barthian emphasis in theology to find a theologian upholding the mystical life as containing an element without which religion is incomplete; and upholding it not only in its practical aspect but also in its philosophical aspects—epistemological, psychological, and ethical. The theologian to whom we refer is

Dr. Thomas Hywel Hughes, who has just retired from the Principalship of the Scottish Congregational College, Edinburgh. Dr. Hughes's pen has been busy in recent years, and his publications on religious experience and religious origins in the light of recent trends in psychology have prepared the way for this which we regard as his most notable work—*The Philosophic Basis of Mysticism* (T. & T. Clark; 12s. 6d. net).

In this work Principal Hughes has garnered the fruits of long and intimate study of mysticism, particularly as handled in modern theology and philosophy. Almost every page of the book bears witness to this; and the value of the book as a basis of study is greatly enhanced by the careful way in which the many references to literature old and new are filled in.

The scope of the work, as already hinted, is wide. In the Introduction, reasons are given in favour of the threefold classification of mysticism into (1) nature, (2) philosophical, (3) religious mysticism. Religious mysticism is said to be the primal and basic type, nature mysticism and philosophical mysticism being aspects of this deeper experience. Informative discussions of the meaning and marks of mysticism lead to the first main division of the book, the epistemological aspect of mysticism.

Here no cleavage is made between intuition and reason, but it is held that intuition yields a deeper knowledge of some aspects of reality than does discursive reason. And the similarity is indicated between the knowledge gained by intuition and that which the mystic acquires of God through love. Reasons are also given for believing that the mystic's claim to more than ordinary knowledge of God is valid, and that his testimony to God as personal can be accepted.

The second is the most elaborate part of the book. It deals with mysticism from the psychological standpoint, though in the approach to the psychology of mysticism, metaphysical considerations are adduced. The psychological treatment proper deals critically with pathological theories, then with psycho-analysis, and finally presents a constructive analysis of the mystical experience in the light of a 'sane' psychology.

In this part the treatment seems to show more freedom and independence on the writer's part than usual. Principal Hughes's books would be stronger, if less informative, were he to be more restrained in his citations of other writers. His chapters sometimes suggest that citations are made for citation's sake. Points that may be noted under the psychological treatment are (1) that the

mystics are represented as not really meaning what they say when they declare that they lose self-consciousness and break with individuality in their experience of union with God; (2) that the supreme act of self-surrender, by which they are united to God, is also a crowning expression of their individuality.

On the third division of the book, which treats of the ethics of mysticism, we shall only say that it brings out well not only the negative ascetic side of mysticism but also its moral creativity.

Of special interest to theologians will be the concluding portions of the work in which are examined objections to the mystical view of reality from the standpoint of the 'dogmatic groundwork' of Christianity. While admitting elements of truth in the objections cited, Dr. Hughes ranges himself on the side of the mystics.

ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL.

The Rev. Professor J. Alexander Findlay, D.D., has followed his valuable book on the 'Acts of the Apostles' by a commentary on *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). We can hardly imagine Dr. Findlay being uninteresting. He reminds us constantly of Dr. Glover in the freshness and allusiveness of his writing, and in the impression he always leaves of having something 'up his sleeve.' We predict that if any one begins the 'General Introduction' he will not be able to stop short of the end, the whole thing is so interesting, even where it is not convincing. We have, of course, the obvious questions answered—why Luke wrote his Gospel, how it was written, who were his authorities. But in addition we have a chapter on certain features of the Gospel, eight in number—Asceticism; A Gospel of Crisis; Social and Economic Interests; Interest in Women; Luke, a townsman and a Greek; Prayer and Praise in the Gospel; Humour and Pathos; and The Gospel of the Holy Spirit.

This is the guide for the average man. He will be instructed without realizing it. There is nothing ponderous or painful about the scholarship here. It is real scholarship but worn very lightly. The only criticism we have to make is that a good many of the writer's suggestions have a slender basis in actual evidence. Dr. Findlay tends sometimes to 'press,' as a golfer would say. His imagination is at work throwing out reconstructions that might be true, probably are true; but the factual basis is not always very solid. This is not a very serious criticism, and if all the 'suggestions' were removed a good deal of the charm of the book would go with them.

The commentary, which occupies most of the book, is on modern lines. That is to say, it is not a line by line or word by word analysis. The text is printed in blocks, and these are followed by comments which are sometimes on phrases, sometimes on the background, but always illuminating. The value of the commentary can only be assessed by use, but Dr. Findlay's equipment is so adequate and his insight so keen that prospective readers may very well count on its competence.

CIVITAS DEI.

We welcome the second volume of Mr. Lionel Curtis's great work, *Civitas Dei* (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net). Perhaps we should have said a second volume for the first seemed complete in itself, and we gathered no hint that it was really the first of three. The first volume dealt with the idea of the Kingdom of God as it was envisaged by Hebrew prophets and inaugurated by Jesus and more or less damaged in the history of the Church. The present book gives a survey not quite of 'mankind from China to Peru,' though Mr. Curtis opens with the Mongol Empire, but with the main lines of the history of European Powers and their overseas expansion so as to show how the world we live in to-day has come into its present almost desperate position. This historical survey is achieved with all Mr. Curtis's wide knowledge, balanced judgment, and felicity of presentation. The task was not to ascertain the facts but to select them without giving a one-sided picture, and for the success with which he has done that the author deserves the highest praise. Mr. Curtis realizes as every sober man must that we live in perilous times. 'In the story told in these pages I can point to no time which appears so fraught with disaster to the human race as a whole as the present.' Yet Mr. Curtis is not in despair. 'If I thought that my pages must end on a note of fear and despair I would burn them before they were printed. My thoughts revert to that scene when he that was born at Bethlehem, despised and rejected of men, was scourged and condemned to the death of a slave and a criminal. From that moment of utter despair there sprang the movement which has gone some way to create, and in the ages before us will bring to fulfilment, the Kingdom of God upon earth, the Divine Commonwealth, a human society based on the laws of God, on the one abiding reality, the infinite duty of men to God, of one to another.'

We shall await with expectancy the final volume of this remarkable trilogy—it is promised soon—in which Mr. Curtis is to deal with the application of

the principle of the Kingdom of God, as expounded in the first volume to the distressful situation analysed in the second.

NAHUM AND HABAKKUK.

Another instalment of the 'Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures' has now appeared. This is on *The Old Testament: Nahum and Habakkuk*, by the late Dom Hugh Bévenot, O.S.B., B.A. (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). At his death Father Hugh left his work incomplete, particularly that part which dealt with Habakkuk. It is, perhaps, for that reason that this book makes a less favourable impression than its predecessors, and it might have been better if Father Lattey had given the whole a much more thorough revision than he felt justified in doing. The translation is sometimes spirited, but occasionally prosaic. The principles of Hebrew metre are inadequately appreciated; there is still some hankering after the strophic theories of D. H. Müller, and the rendering of Nah 2¹² violates one of the basic principles of Hebrew prosody. Thus:

Behold upon the hills the feet of him

That beareth good tidings, that maketh salvation known

creates an impossible cæsura between a construct and its genitive. The line can be scanned only by taking the first word as anacrusis:

Behold!

Upon the hills the feet of him that beareth
good tidings,

That maketh salvation known.

Conservatism in the treatment of the text—an admirable principle in itself—is sometimes carried too far. More serious is the failure to discuss adequately the problems presented by the Book of Habakkuk. Here we miss, not only a real attempt to identify the historical situation, but any appreciation of the place the prophet holds in the history of religious thought. As far as we know, the great questions which we call the problem of suffering first reached explicit statement in Hab 1¹³. Yet this verse, one of the pivots of revelation, has but slight comment, and even in the Introduction there is no reference to its importance. It is unfortunate that blemishes of this kind have been allowed to remain, for Father Hugh might well have removed them if he had lived to complete his work, and they would certainly not have appeared had the general editor, Father Lattey,

undertaken the whole book *de novo*. We may hope that later issues in this series may reach again the high standard set by the earlier parts.

IDEALS OF MINISTRY.

The Rev. Hubert S. Box, D.D., Ph.D., has edited a volume by various writers which is issued under the general title of *Priesthood* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net). Its aim is to uphold the true ideal of ministry in spiritual things. Among the thirteen contributors to the volume are F. L. Cross, Clement F. Rogers, W. J. Sparrow Simpson, A. G. Hebert, and the Editor himself, all of whom are well known in Anglican High Church circles by reason of former publications. The work begins with a consideration of the theology of priesthood, and deals also with such subjects as priesthood in the New Testament and the Early Church; the priest and the Mass; the priest as confessor, preacher, apologist, and teacher of prayer; the priest in his study; and the priest's interior life. The contributors are at one in their general point of view, and their contributions are for the most part learned and scholarly; and there is much in their pages from which non-Anglican ministers might also profit. This is particularly so in the case of the last chapter, which treats of the problem of the Church in relation to the modern world. The dilemma which confronts the Church in the modern world, of being in the world and yet not of the world, is appreciated by Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Nonconformist as well as by Anglo-Catholic. 'Either we start with the pure Word of God, and then it is very difficult to interpret it in terms of contemporary culture; or if we start with an acceptance of contemporary culture, we cannot do other than produce a weakened version of Christianity.' 'In the age of humanism this dilemma was insoluble. But with the disintegration of humanism the case becomes different.'

The latest Halley Stewart Lecture has been written by Sir Percy Alden, M.A., and appears under the title of *Aspects of a Changing Social Structure* (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net). Sir Percy deals with the changes that have been taking place in what may be called the social structure as well as in the social services. He recognizes the advances that have been made in various directions, partly due to pressure from organized labour, but partly due also (as Benjamin Kidd long ago argued) to the sense of

fair play and justice in the possessing class. But the author is mainly concerned to point out the need of further improvement, and he looks to the future as likely to show more applications of the collectivism which at present deals with sanitation, water, education, but needs to be pursued into other fields. The subjects of the different chapters are The Child, Health, Housing, Security, The Future of Industry, Coal and Agriculture, and on all these matters the author has a great deal to say that is well-informed and even urgent. It is books like this one that are gradually persuading the great mass of Christian people that the principles of the gospel, and the revolutionary truth implicit in much of Christ's teaching, must be embodied in our national and social life as well as in our individual conduct. The matter is pressing.

There are several reasons why a book on the Lord's Prayer is welcome. One is that many people do not understand the prayer. Another, and more important one, is that it contains the whole of Christianity, on its Godward as well as its manward side. *The Prayer of Prayers*, by the Rev. J. Burr, M.A. (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net), then makes a place for itself. No doubt there are many books on the subject, but this great prayer needs to be interpreted afresh to each generation. Mr. Burr's book is a good example of pulpit exposition, and as such will be useful both to clergy and laity.

Of all the books of the Apocrypha, it is the Wisdom of Solomon whose absence from the normal Bible is most to be regretted. We have, then, cause to be grateful to Mr. E. H. Blakeney, M.A., for having issued an edition of the first nine chapters, to which he has added 11²³⁻²⁶—*The Praises of Wisdom; being Part I. of the Book of Wisdom: A Revised Translation, with Notes* (Blackwell; 7s. 6d. net). The text and an English translation are placed on opposite pages, and there are notes at the end of the book, together with a short glossary including some of the less familiar Greek words in the text. Mr. Blakeney does not claim to be an expert in Biblical subjects, but he has an enthusiasm for great literature, and has given an interesting presentation of the book. He believes that the sections he selects should be regarded as a separate work from the remaining chapters, and on a point of this kind his judgment is certainly not to be disregarded. In making his translation he has used the English A.V., with very frequent modifications; there are comparatively few verses in which he has simply transcribed the text. Some of these altera-

tions are distinctly happy, especially where he has used a better text than that underlying the A.V. In other cases, however, the reader will prefer the familiar renderings. Is 'confidence,' for instance, really a better rendering of *παρηγορία* than 'boldness'? (v.¹) The complete omission from the translation of the last clause of v.¹² is probably a slip. Mr. Blakeney does not tell us, even in his

admirable introduction, what text he prints; it is not that of Swete or of Rahlfs, and sometimes, as in v.¹⁴, we have curious problems presented by a comparison of text, translation, and notes. The notes themselves contain a wealth of reference to other literature, ancient and modern. The book is not intended, however, for scholars, and is not to be compared with such an edition as that of Deane; its purpose is rather to rouse the interest of a wider public, and in that it should succeed. It is beautifully printed, and the publishers are to be congratulated on the general excellence of its form.

The Rev. James T. Hudson, B.D., B.A., Examiner in New Testament Studies, Didsbury College, Manchester, has issued an edition of *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (T. & T. Clark; 2s. net), containing an Introduction, Translation, and Marginal Analysis. It is designed as an aid to the study of the Greek text of the Epistle and to understanding the connexion of thought. The Introduction records the chief reasons why the Epistle is no longer regarded as Pauline or as written to the Hebrews; points out that the central idea in the Epistle is the Melchizedekan priesthood of Christ; but contends, as against E. F. Scott, that for the writer of the Epistle Old Testament categories are but adumbrations of the religious reality which is offered us in Jesus. We readily commend this little work, as useful within its limits both for the student and for the general reader.

In *Hebrew Religion between the Testaments* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net) the Rev. Thomas Walker, D.D., has given an outline of what the pious Jew believed in the centuries which immediately preceded Jesus. The six chapters deal with the Idea of God, the Reign of God, Trust in God's Special Providence, Men's Notion of Themselves, their Conception of their Duty, and their Hope of the Hereafter. Dr. Walker is content to state the views expressed in the apocryphal and eschatological literature of the time with little or no discussion, though he does note divergent opinions. The book consists very largely of actual quotations from the various texts, and may be regarded as a useful store of

material from which the reader can form his own opinions; obviously Dr. Walker has spent great labour on its compilation.

An attempt has been made to meet the crying need for a *Grammar of the Biblical Aramaic* in English by the Rev. H. L. Creager, S.T.M. (to be obtained of the author at Palmyra, N.J., U.S.A., \$1.10). The work has been well done; there are a few statements which might be challenged by a student of comparative Semitic philology, but Mr. Creager has followed Marti fairly closely in his description of the language. He has, however, neglected the supra-linear pointing, which is the more to be regretted since the common system of dots and dashes is better adapted to Hebrew than to Aramaic, and we may suspect that in some cases (especially with the gutturals) the vocalization has been modified to suit Hebrew characteristics. A few reading exercises have been appended; this part of the work might have been expanded with advantage, and certainly English into Aramaic exercises should have been included. All experience shows that a student learns a language far more thoroughly by having to write it than by merely reading it. A knowledge of Hebrew is presupposed throughout. This is quite justifiable, since the literature in Biblical Aramaic is very scanty, and is not likely to be read by any one ignorant of Hebrew.

Mr. Creager has found the expense of printing too great, and has had his work mimeographed. It is quite clear and easy to read, but suffers from the uniformity of type. In a grammar of this kind it is a valuable help to be able to distinguish the relative importance of various paragraphs by different types. It is especially awkward to have the footnotes in the same type as the text. This, however, is inevitable in the circumstances, and Mr. Creager has done his best to fill a serious gap in our Semitic text-books.

The Reformation in England is the latest addition we have seen to the singularly excellent series—Duckworth's Theology Series (Duckworth; 5s. net). It is from the able hand of Dr. L. Elliott-Binns, and we can most cordially commend it. In nearly every country the Reformation was a highly complex event. Numerous motives, some worthy, some quite unworthy, and in many cases mixed, led to the breach with Rome. This was the case not least in England; and Dr. Elliott-Binns deserves our thanks for the impartial way in which he discusses the causes for the breach with the old obedience. Within the limits of space prescribed he has

contrived to pack a great deal of learning and a great many facts. He has an instinct for what is vital, and the rare power of resisting the temptation to obscure the wood by over-minute examination of the various trees. This is an interesting, learned, and suggestive book for which we anticipate a wide public.

A great deal of work has been done, especially in America, in the study of religious experience from the purely psychological point of view. In this connexion the statistical method of the questionnaire has been much favoured. In *A Psychological Study of Religious Conversion*, by Mr. W. Lawson Jones, M.A. (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net), we have a fresh example of this kind of work. The writer, working in connexion with the University of Reading Research Board, issued a questionnaire on conversion which does not seem to have brought in many replies, and supplemented it by personal interviews. In this way he acquired a certain amount of data which he proceeds to tabulate and comment upon. He divides the groups into gradual and non-gradual types of conversion, and under each heading he discusses such matters as Age-frequencies, Pre-conversion Situations, Balance of Psychological Factors. The work is very competently done, although no results of any special freshness or value are reported. In the concluding chapters the writer deals with the Conditions and Consequences of Religious Conversion, and draws comparisons between the phenomena of religious conversion and those of other forms of awakening. Comparing the results of conversion in Christian and non-Christian communities he concludes: 'In Christianity we find what, from both the standpoint of individual good and of social well-being, is the highest type of religious conversion. But, even in its lowest forms, religious conversion is a "reorganization of the self and a modification of behaviour" which contains the possibility of considerable moral developments.'

From World Force to World Fellowship, by Mr. George F. Wates (Lindsey Press; 2s. 6d. net), is a little book written with good intention doubtless, but with little grip or coherence. It is difficult indeed to gather what the writer would be at. He rambles through history commenting on anything that catches his eye—Napoleon, Freud, British-Israelism, the Oxford Group, and so on, but there is little in the way of connected thread in his discourse. His obvious desire is to promote good fellowship but he has no constructive suggestions to offer.

A fourth issue of Dr. Samuel G. Green's *Handbook of Church History* has appeared, revised by Dr. L. Elliott-Binns (Lutterworth Press; 12s. 6d. net). Green's *Handbook* enjoyed, and deserved to, a lengthy period of use as a text-book in theological colleges. It covers the period from the Apostolic Age to the dawn of the Reformation. The Middle Ages are too much neglected in theological curricula; and it is well for students to have so extended a study as this. The new edition remains essentially Dr. Green's work. Dr. Elliott-Binns has condensed the matter, added numerous references to authorities, and indicated what modifications more recent investigation has necessitated. All those changes are for the good; and we do not doubt that in its new form 'Green's *Handbook*' will have a fresh popularity as a competent, scholarly, and well-written guide.

No Casual Creed, by the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, (Macmillan; 5s. net), is not a big book, though the author is optimistic in hoping that it will be read through 'at a sitting.' It may be called, as he calls it, a small book, and for its size he has a delightful apologia in the preface. A small book, he says, can contain the root of the matter, as a thimbleful of whisky is more potent than a gallon of lemonade. And further, a brief treatment of great subjects can be of great use, provided it is to the point. 'After all size is nothing,' with which sentiment all the small men in the world concur. Mr. Hardwick has quite a good opinion of his book, and we are sure many people will agree with him in this also. The book contains a series of chapters on belief, or rather on great subjects of belief. So far as they go, the discussions are positive and helpful. They deal with Man, Life and Death, Experience of God (a good chapter), The Problem of Evil, Prayer, Jesus and Deity, among other subjects; and it is highly probable that those who are feeling their way in these matters will receive real guidance from one who, if somewhat indefinite in his conclusions, has thought out things for himself, and has a faith of his own.

The Precious Jewel of the Word, by the Rev. W. A. Rice, M.A. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. net), is, of course, about the Bible. Mr. Rice is a scholar, a missionary, and one of the revisers of the Persian Bible, and his book is inspired by a love of the Scriptures which he hopes to share with others. There is here a good deal about the history of the English Bible (Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, and Parker), about Bible translation and distribution,

and about what the Bible has been to some of the great ones of the earth. There is an interesting chapter on favourite texts.

The present condition and the future of Palestine are not the least of the many difficult problems with which the world is faced to-day. The Jewish case is familiar to most people in Great Britain; those who wish to see the other side cannot do better than consult *The Palestine Mandate, Invalid and Impracticable*, by Mr. W. F. Boustany, B.A. (Palestine Information Centre, London; 1s. 6d. net). Mr. Boustany states the Arab's case without rhetoric and with direct logic, making it clear that in his view nothing less than the abrogation of the Balfour Declaration and the establishment of a free, self-governing institution will satisfy him. As is usual where internal conflict prevails in territory administered by Great Britain, it is the Government which is blamed for the situation, not the rival community in Palestine. Mr. Boustany's frank and honest statement, however, is not wholly convincing, primarily because it applies logical reasoning with a rigidity which is probably valid only in Mathematics. The book is well documented, but the argument would at times have been easier to follow if the British statement of policy, issued in 1930, had been printed separately and in full.

Only one who has tried to put great thoughts into very simple language knows how difficult the task can be. Consequently the great merit of such a book as *The Prophetic Road to God*, by Mr. T. H. Sutcliffe, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), may easily be missed by the casual reader. The writer makes no claim to speak with first-hand authority, and parts of his book may seem to be hardly satisfactory—notably the chapter on the problem of suffering. Here there is no mention of Habakkuk or of the 'Servant Songs,' and the Book of Job is quite inadequately treated. Possibly Mr. Sutcliffe felt that the subject lay rather outside his proper sphere in this book, and therefore was content with a brief outline. But he has studied modern literature about the Prophets to good purpose, and presents his material in beautifully clear language. We have here an outline of the whole spiritual history of Israel, with special emphasis on the prophetic teaching; Mr. Sutcliffe rightly sees that even the Prophets cannot be isolated from the general

course of religious history. The book will serve as an admirable elementary introduction to its subject, but its author would be the first to say that it is an introduction only, and that the reader should pass on to other books, especially those of the Prophets themselves. If his aim be to attract people to this part of the Bible with a view to further study on it, then he has produced a book admirably adapted to fulfil its purpose.

The Path to the Presence, by Mr. Thomas Ashbridge (Stockwell; 2s. 6d. net), is an interesting little book of a kind less common to-day than it once was. The writer takes for his subject the Tabernacle in the wilderness, and from its various arrangements and sacrifices he draws spiritual lessons. These lessons are simple and direct, with very little that is forced or fanciful, which makes the reading of the book both pleasant and spiritually profitable.

Pacifism, as every one knows, is one of the live questions of the hour, and is the subject of discussion in the courts and assemblies of all the churches. Last May there was presented to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland an elaborate report prepared by a specially appointed committee. This is now published with appendices under the title of *The Church's Attitude to Peace and War* (S.C.M.; 1s. net). The Committee, as was to be expected from its composition, found itself unable to reach unanimity, so it had to present a majority and a minority report. This has the advantage, however, of presenting both sides of the question, and readers will find in the body of the report and in the appendices much valuable material which may help them towards reaching an enlightened and Christian view on the subject.

The need for a new outbreak of Christianity is being felt even more keenly in America than in Europe. *The Glorious Revival under King Hezekiah*, by the Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D.D. (Zonder-van Publishing House; 3s. 6d.), is an appeal for such a movement, and takes the form of a series of addresses based on the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's reforms. Many readers in this country will endorse Dr. Smith's contention that there can be no true revival till the Church returns to the Bible, and concentrates her preaching on a crucified Christ.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTSHIRE.

ONE hundred more of the valuable Nuzi tablets have recently been translated by Professors Pfeiffer and Speiser of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Coming like the rest of the texts from a Hurrian community (near *Kirkūk*, in Assyria) which had intimate associations with the early Hebrews, they throw an altogether new light on many passages in the patriarchal narratives. They necessitate, in fact, a reinterpretation of these, for they show beyond any doubt that the social background portrayed in the narratives is not that of the eighth and ninth centuries, when they are believed to have been compiled, but that of north Mesopotamia many ages earlier, as far back indeed as the time of Jacob, and the compilers must have had authentic material before them, probably written as well as oral, dating from these earlier ages. In the light of these new tablets, taken along with others already published, much can be said in explanation of certain patriarchal customs. The story of Jacob and Laban (Gn 29-31), for instance, takes on a new aspect. According to one tablet, it was the custom for the parents to give a handmaid to a daughter on her marriage, and this is precisely what Laban did to Leah and Rachel (Gn 29^{24, 29}). Judging from circumstances described in another tablet, there seems ground for believing that Laban had adopted Jacob as his son, and by Hurrian law of adoption had the proprietorship of him as well as of his wives, and even of his children and flocks. Hence it was that he could say to Jacob (Gn 31⁴³), 'The daughters are my daughters, and the children are my children, and the flocks are my flocks, and all that thou seest is mine.' Laban had thus every right to inflict penalty on Jacob for running off and taking some of the household with him, but he chose to be lenient for religious reasons. 'It is in the power of my hand,' he said, 'to do you hurt; but the God of your father spake unto me yesternight, saying . . . speak not to Jacob either good or bad.' Moreover, the tablets show that an adopted son had no right to the household gods or *teraphim* (which constituted the chief title to the inheritance), if there was a begotten son living, and consequently the indignation of Laban, who had now sons of his own, at Jacob's action was justified, 'Wherefore hast thou stolen my gods?' (Gn 31³⁰). Apart from such illustrations of the patriarchal period which are numerous, the tablets reveal the

existence of many customs found later among the Israelites. Thus the gleanings of the cornfields appear to have been the perquisites of the poor and destitute, as we find in the Pentateuchal codes (Lv 19^{9f.} 23²², Dt 24¹⁹⁻²¹), for one of the tablets, which is reminiscent of the Book of Ruth, refers to gleaning rights on the part of the lower classes of Nuzians. We read of these rights being abused by servants who had come ostensibly to glean, but who appropriated grain to which they were not entitled, and ended up by being prosecuted as thieves. One cannot study these Nuzi texts without noting the wonderful state of civilization there at the beginning of the fifteenth century B.C. In connexion with matters of civil government, some of the records read like those of modern times. The city of Nuzi was governed by a Mayor, and fourteen of the texts deal with a legal trial of him and several of his henchmen for certain alleged offences, principally bribery and corruption. The noteworthy fact is that these men could be and ultimately were brought to court for their misdeeds—a remarkable proof of the advanced condition of social and political life in these regions three thousand five hundred years ago. Further evidence of the excellent civil organization of the Hurrians, equal almost to that of modern times, may be seen in the fact, referred to in one of the tablets, that a standard measure unit, made of copper, was kept in the gate of the 'City of the gods' at Arrapha (modern *Kirkūk*). This was a more scientific basis of measurement than the primitive one adopted by the Israelites (six palms or twenty-four fingers = a cubit), which was probably derived from Egypt.

Among the several thousand cuneiform tablets unearthed at Mari (*Tell Hāriri*, in north Mesopotamia) are numerous letters to Zimrilim, the last king of this remarkable city-state, who was a contemporary of Hammurabi of Babylon (c. 2067-2024 B.C.). As these concern events in the days of Abraham, only a few years after he had left Mesopotamia for Canaan (Gn 11³¹), they are of supreme importance to the Biblical historian. They give us most interesting information not only about Mari, but the many cities round about (they contain the names of 150 unknown to us before), thus adding considerably to our geographical knowledge of these regions at that time. We learn that Babylonian

was called the country of Kurda, that the name of the King of Haran (where Abraham had been living) was Ashditakum, and that the main traffic at Carchemish was in wood, including cedar. The letters describe the commercial life, social customs, military equipment, and other matters. The country appears to have had only a precarious security, as it was frequently exposed to revolts within and attacks from outside. Among other peoples who attempted to seize the city were the Hebrews (*Habiru*), and it is not improbable that these belonged to the same section as the followers of Abraham. Devastating incursions into the Mari district were of common occurrence, including pillaging of villages, massacre of the inhabitants, and sheep-stealing, and there were incessant conflicts between different towns. As the tablets number over 14,000, they will prove an abundant and precious mine for our knowledge of the ancient East, and will take their place beside those of Nineveh, Tell el-Amarna, Tello, Boghaz-keui, Yorgha-Tépé, and Ras Shamra.

The conclusion came to by the late Madame Krause-Marquet and her assistant excavators at Ai that this city was uninhabited at the time of the Israelite entry into Canaan, and that consequently the picturesque and dramatic narrative in chapters 7 and 8 of Joshua is mere untrustworthy legend, has raised considerable discussion among Biblical scholars. As stated in a previous article, the origin of the city goes back to about 3000 B.C., or earlier, when it was an almost impregnable stronghold. Its name at that time, before it became known as Ai (or '*The Ai*', as the Biblical narrative calls it, *i.e.* '*The Ruin*'), seems to have been Beth-aven (cf. Jos 7²), which may be a primitive form of Beth-Hadad, '*Temple of Hadad*.' After many vicissitudes, it was destroyed by a great conflagration (probably the work of enemies) about 2000 B.C. Its inhabitants were driven away, its palace and sanctuary were levelled to the ground, and its powerful fortifications were partly overthrown. According to the excavators' conclusions, it remained in this deserted condition till the Iron Age, about 1200 B.C., when a small population took possession of part of the site, adjoining the acropolis. After about a century, however, or not more than one and a half, their occupation ceased, and the place was finally abandoned. It is evident from all this that when Joshua entered Canaan (*c.* 1400 B.C.), the city must have been in ruins. In a recent article, however, we drew attention to the fact that potsherds belonging to the late Bronze Age (*c.* 1600-1200 B.C.)

had been discovered on the site some years ago, and that a stronghold of this nature could not have been entirely uninhabited during such a long period. Apart from the potsherds, there are undoubtedly very good grounds for this view, and it is not impossible that further excavation (which is being undertaken by M. André Parrot) may support it. At the same time, whether we accept it or not, a theory put forward by Père Vincent allows us to assume the correctness of Madame Krause-Marquet's conclusions, and also preserves the historicity of the narrative in Joshua. Jericho had just been conquered and burnt to the ground. It was of prime importance to the Israelites that they should not remain in the Jordan Valley, but should advance at once into the high country north and west. The best, and practically the only, route open to them was through the gap by Ai and Bethel. The Canaanite clans round about (including those in Bethel, Jos 8¹⁷), thoroughly alarmed at the fate of Jericho and thrown on the alert, leagued themselves together to bar the advance. They concentrated their forces on the summit of '*The Ruin*,' which was still a veritable and formidable place of defence. Here they probably erected shelters, brought all necessary provisions and equipment, and for the time being turned the place into an armed stronghold. Hence Joshua's attack on it, so graphically described in the two chapters, and hence also the narrator's reference to it not only as '*The Ruin*' (which is the correct term and the one he generally uses), but also as a '*city*' (so far as its external appearance under the occupation went). This theory of Vincent's seems to be conformable to fact, for we have only to realize the strategic importance of Ai for the Canaanites. Not only did the site command a wide view in the Jericho direction, but there were strong defensive walls on the south (still thirteen to sixteen feet high in some places), while steep watercourses enclose the site on all the other sides. Here the Canaanite forces could find secure shelter, and defend themselves against the advancing Israelites. We have an instance of the same thing in the action taken by the Bedouin tribes in southern Trans-Jordan in 1895, when the Turkish government attempted to establish a military post among them. These tribes, having formed a confederacy, took up their position in some ruined entrenchments which had been occupied by the Romans and Nabateans, and it required a large body of troops, with modern equipment, to dislodge them. The ramparts of Ai offered a much more powerful shelter to the Canaanites, and it was only by a ruse or stratagem

on the part of Joshua that the place was captured. Women as well as men are stated to have been among the slain (8²⁵), it is true, but this does not imply a resident occupation, it simply accords with the fact that in the East the women take part in combat. But, as the place was a ruin, occupied only temporarily, there is no mention of children, as we find in the case of Jericho (6²¹). If this theory of Vincent's be correct, the narrative in Joshua takes on a new meaning. It has no doubt been adorned with certain adventitious elements, but, after all, it becomes the actual account of a striking episode in the Israelite conquest of Canaan.

Sir Charles Marston has favoured the writer with an account of the more recent excavations at Lachish. The Great Shaft, which is rectangular in shape (84 by 74 feet wide) and descends vertically through the limestone rock beneath the city, has now been opened up and reaches a depth of 85 feet. It has no stairway down, and its purpose is still a mystery, though it is believed to have been connected with the water-supply of the city. The digging of such a huge pit by the ancient inhabitants must have required enormous labour and skill. It meant the quarrying out and removal of some five hundred thousand cubic feet of solid rock with the aid of only primitive tools of flint, copper, or soft iron (the marks of which are still fresh). The chasm appears to have been constructed at the time of the Jewish monarchy, though it may have been an enlargement of a far earlier work. It must have been clear and open when Nebuchadrezzar destroyed the city (587 B.C.), for the burnt débris has been found thrown into it to a depth of 30 feet. If it was connected with the water-supply, it reminds us of the underground water tunnels which have been found at Jerusalem, Megiddo, and other places, and which are quite characteristic of the fortified cities of Canaan. It is on such a huge scale, however, that it surpasses anything hitherto discovered in Palestine, and we must await further reports as to its purpose. It may well remind us of the text (Is 51¹), 'Look unto the rock whence ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye were digged.'

Another important feature of recent excavation at Lachish has been the discovery of a large rock-tomb, consisting of three chambers. The remains in these, it was found, had been destroyed by fire, no doubt as an act of desecration. Some children employed by the expedition managed to pick out from the burnt ashes not only bronze and copper articles (melted by the heat), but no less than 192 Egyptian scarabs, some of which are gold-mounted.

There were also four alabaster toilet vases, a bronze razor, some toggle-pins, two cylinder seals of the Syro-Hittite type, fragments of glass vessels, much bead work, and numerous arrow-heads. The wealth displayed makes it possible that the tomb was a royal one, and that the occupants had been closely connected with Egypt. The scarabs include those of King Shesha (or Apopa) of the sixteenth dynasty, as well as of Thotmes III. (c. 1501 B.C.), Amenhotep II. (c. 1447 B.C.), Thotmes IV. (c. 1423 B.C.), and Amenhotep III. (c. 1419-1383 B.C.). The contents thus cover the period from Hyksos times (the sixteenth dynasty) down to the entry of the Israelites under Joshua (c. 1400 B.C.). The interments in this particular tomb seem to have come to an end at this time, and the destruction no doubt occurred then. Was it the family tomb of Zimrida, the governor of Lachish, who, according to the Amarna tablets, resisted the *Habiru* (Hebrew) invasion and was taken prisoner and slain? When the city settled down under the Hebrew Conquest, some of the inhabitants seem to have continued their association with Egypt, for the contents of the tombs adjoining the desecrated one proved to contain the scarabs of some of the succeeding Pharaohs, namely, Ay, Horemheb, and Rameses II. But the break in the succession of Egyptian royal scarabs about 1400 B.C., and the burning of the main tomb at this time, may not be unconnected with the Israelite Conquest.

The remainder of the recent finds at Lachish include several objects with writing on them. One of these is a Hyksos dagger (believed to date c. 1600 B.C.), with an inscription down the centre of the blade. The inscription consists of four characters, two of which Mr. Starkey connects with the ancient Semitic script of Sinai. A second inscribed object is a carnelian quartz seal, beautifully polished, and having on its lowest space the name Asahiah, and on its middle one five Hebrew letters reading 'For Shephatiah.' Both these names are well-known Biblical ones, and here they probably refer to individuals in the time of Jeremiah (cf. Jer 38¹, 2 K 22^{12, 14}). A third object is a bowl, inscribed in Egyptian hieratics both on the interior and the exterior, and thought to date c. 1250 B.C. Unfortunately, it is broken into numerous fragments, but twenty-five of these have been recovered, and when put together the whole measures seven inches across and just over two inches deep. The object had evidently been brought from Egypt, for the writing, so far as it can be deciphered, refers to certain measures of wheat gathered from the harvest in certain months of Inundation.

The Beatitude of Faith in the Unseen.

BY HERBERT G. WOOD, D.D., SELLY OAK, BIRMINGHAM.

'BLESSED are they that have not seen, and yet have believed' (Jn 20²⁹).—There are two beatitudes in the Fourth Gospel. The one declares the happiness that attends on practical obedience. 'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.' The other pronounces blessed those who do not let their faith depend upon the kind of verification through touch and sight which Thomas demanded.

In recording such sayings the Fourth Gospel is in line with the Synoptics. Beatitudes were the form in which Jesus embodied His value-judgments. Not only did they serve as the introduction to set teaching as in the Sermon on the Mount, but they also fell from His lips as the spontaneous response to incidental challenges. Of the two Johannine beatitudes, the first might be regarded as summing up the lesson of the concluding section of the Sermon on the Mount. The wise hearers must be doers of the Word. But the second, 'Blessed are such as believe though they have not seen,' stands in apparent contrast with the saying in Q, 'Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see.' Indeed, we have here a pair of beatitudes at once contrasting and complementary, and the truth of both may be realized in our experience.

The blessing pronounced on those who share the disciples' vision is twofold. The generation to which they belonged was fortunate in that it witnessed the fulfilment of God's promises. To be the contemporaries of great events is in itself a privilege. Yet it is a dubious privilege unless we see the meaning of events and realize their greatness. Unlike those without, for whom things happened in parables, the disciples could in a measure read the signs of the times and were entrusted with the mystery of the kingdom of God. They not only lived in the days of the Son of Man, but also knew themselves to be entering a new age. Vision and enlightenment were the occasion of their happiness.

The blessing on those who see belongs in some degree to all who are born into a civilization influenced by Christ. It is not for nothing that we make Christ's coming the crisis of history and distinguish the ages before Christ from the ages that have followed His appearing. Conventionally we are living in the year of grace 1937, and the convention is no idle one. The world is a different place because of a decisive happening some nineteen hundred years ago. All men benefit thereby, but

the true blessing rests on those who realize their debt to Christ. Blessed are those who share the vision and enlightenment of the first disciples.

How, then, is the beatitude at the close of John's Gospel to be related to the blessing on those who see, recorded in Lk 10²³? Does it suggest that those who longed to see what the disciples saw and who had to live on hope were really more to be felicitated than the disciples themselves? That would be a strange paradox, not to be accepted without close examination.

It should be noted in the first place that this Johannine beatitude is closely related to the Evangelist's treatment of miracle. There is in the Fourth Gospel a heightening of the miraculous, accompanied by a depreciation of all faith which rests on miracle. The works of Jesus are works of creative power, from the turning of water into wine to the restoring to life of one who had been four days dead. Yet the faith and wonder evoked by such works of power are felt to be of poor spiritual quality. Jesus did not trust Himself to those who believed on His name merely because they saw signs. The nobleman's request for the healing of his son is met with the discouraging comment, 'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.' Such faith is little worth. The multitude that was miraculously fed is rebuked because they appreciated only the practical benefit of the miracle and did not see or care to see its spiritual meaning. Even the raising of Lazarus reads like a reluctant concession to human weakness. A deeper faith would have realized the truth that Jesus is the Resurrection and the Life, without waiting for the confirmation provided by the recall of Lazarus from the grave. If, then, Thomas had realized the true meaning of his intercourse with Jesus, he would never have doubted the Resurrection or sought to bolster up his faith by the crude tests of the senses.

Yet all of us can understand the attitude of Thomas, and the apostolic succession which derives from him has never failed in the Church! Perhaps all of us at some time or other have stood within it, for all of us crave for outward evidence of spiritual things. 'Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.' With Philip we think some vision of God vouchsafed to our physical sight would remove all our doubts!

But O, dear Lord, we cry,
That we Thy face could see!—
Thy blessed face, one moment's space:
Then might we follow Thee!

Is not the appeal of the doctrine of the Real Presence to be found in part at least in the satisfaction it promises to this natural human longing? The Lord's presence, thing-wise, so that we may see and taste and handle—that is our deep desire! And is not Jesus saying in effect to His disciples in this beatitude, Blessed are those who do not demand or depend on My *real* presence!—giving to 'real' its strict meaning, My presence as a thing?

In truth Philip was mistaken in supposing that some momentary outward vision of God would suffice. Once we start seeking outward signs to confirm faith, we are never satisfied. We want perpetual miracle, repeated visions. If faith is to depend upon healings as in many modern movements, the healings must be constantly renewed. Of such evidence we can never have enough. But we look and long for more, precisely because we do not appreciate the value of what is already given to us. This is admirably expressed in a passage in *John Inglesant*, where de Cressy says: 'I have many come to me: and they usually one and all come with the exact words of the blessed gospel on their lips, "Sir, we would see Jesus." And I look them in the face often, and wonder, and often find no words to speak. See Jesus, I often think, I do not doubt it! who would not wish to see Him Who is the fulness of all perfection that the heart and intellect ever conceived, in Whom all creation has its centre, all the troubles and sorrows of life have their cure, all the longings of carnal men their fruition? But why come to me? Is He not walking to and fro on the earth continually, in every act of charity and self-sacrifice that is done among men? Is He not offered daily on every altar, preached continually from every pulpit? Why come to me? Old men of sixty and seventy come to me with these very words, "Sir, we would see Jesus." If the course of sixty years, if the troubles and confusions of a long life, if He Himself has not revealed this Beatific Vision to them—how can I?'

Our craving for miracle and sign, and our reliance on outward manifestations of Christ's presence indicate a shrinking from the adventure and surrender of true faith. The disciples in the Upper Room felt they could not go on if the outward presence of the Master were withdrawn, and the hardest thing for them to believe was that His going from them would be to their advantage. Yet only so could their hold on spiritual realities deepen

and strengthen. They must learn to play the man as seeing Him who is invisible. The guidance of the Spirit of Truth would be theirs only when they could no longer turn to a Lord present with them in the outward. Perhaps the beatitude goes even further and suggests that a richer blessing may rest upon those who have to walk in darkness rather than light and to exercise faith amid affliction and uncertainty rather than with assurance. Many good Christians complain that they are left without signs, unvisited and compelled to walk in darkness, and they fail to recognize that their apparent limitation may be the very ground of blessing. 'Happy are they who have not seen, and yet have believed.'

In a little meditation on 'Darkness and Light,' a writer in *The Friend* suggests that when God reveals Himself in terms of light, we are inclined to assume that it is a sign of God's favour. She then suggests that because light is a human good and agreeable to man, 'the man who is called to serve God in darkness has a stern task. Walking in darkness, he must order his life as though he walked in the brightness of day. . . . It is an adventure fraught with glorious possibilities.' 'The man who has the supreme courage to walk in darkness as though the light were true for him, radiates and transmits to others some quality of that which he seeks.' In the call to this adventure, we may discern with old Sir Thomas Browne, 'the dissembled favours of God's affection.'

It is surely true that those who believe without the confirmation of sight are driven to lay hold more firmly on the things which have already been given to them in their experience. Henry Drummond as a young man, when he returned to college after participating in Moody's evangelistic campaign, found himself perplexed and uncertain as to his future. He wrote to one of his friends, 'My life is still the same knotless thread that it used to be. I have been trying to do a little here and there, but personally I see no further than before. And, do you know, a strange thought comes to me sometimes that "waiting" has the same kind of effect upon one that affliction has? I do not know truly if this be so, for I do not know what affliction is: but I sometimes wonder whether or not the effects may not to some small extent run in the same lines.' Affliction compels us to seek that which is unseen and eternal and to dwell upon those treasures which death cannot touch. And the experience of 'waiting' likewise turns our thoughts to occasions when God's Will has been clear to us. And this may suggest the link between our two beatitudes.

If, on the one hand, we have no vision, if our eyes have never been blest in seeing, we have little to dwell upon, when vision is denied. If, on the other hand, we have not times when faith is proved in darkness, we never value the things that are ours, never probe below the surface-wonder to the spiritual reality beneath.

In some such way Henry T. Hodgkin interpreted illness and the impossibility of planning his future which illness brought with it. 'My discipline these days has been in part that of uncertainty. We don't see much on that subject, and when a person's whole life is without any certainties it must be almost impossible to find any values to be learnt through uncertainty.' (This sentence hints at the association of the two beatitudes. If we have not been blest with vision, we shall not qualify for the blessing on those who have not seen!) 'For my part, I have been caused to think of some of the amazing surenesses that I have as anchors—The love and trust of friends, the confidence that one's work is worth while, the belief in values for which it is worth dying, the quiet assurance that one's life has been and is in God's hands and that, through all one's mistakes, it has been guided to a goal. Such things are so much bigger than the uncertainties of what to do next or how to plan for this or that. *I suppose Jesus knew that men sometimes have to come to the big certainties by losing the lesser ones.*' That must be part of the meaning of this beatitude. How often we clutch at the lesser certainties and lose our hold on the larger!

The blessing on those who have not seen is closely

connected not only with the depreciation of faith based on miracle which is a feature of the Fourth Gospel, but also with another characteristic of the Gospel, its interest in those who will believe through the apostolic preaching. All subsequent generations of Christians are within the compass of the High-priestly prayer of ch. 17. Only a few of the first disciples could enjoy the privilege claimed by Thomas and granted to him. Those who come after must depend upon the witness of others and be content with historic tradition. Yet in this very dependence and in the limitations it implies, those who do not see may be blest. For, as Erasmus wrote of the Gospels, 'These writings bring back to you the living image of that holy mind, and restore to you Christ Himself, teaching, healing, dying, rising, in a word so completely present that you would hardly see Him better could you look on Him with your bodily eyes!' And it must be remembered that the Evangelist is not concerned with the relations of faith and sight in general, but with faith in Jesus Christ and physical contact with Him. There may even be an echo of the beatitude in the sentence in 1 P, 'Jesus Christ whom not having seen ye love; in whom ye trust, although as yet ye see him not, and believing, rejoice with joy unspeakable.' This verse at least describes the subjects of the beatitude, which finds fresh fulfilment as the generations pass.

Yet, though I have not seen, and still
Must rest in faith alone,
I love Thee, dearest Lord, and will,
Unseen but not unknown.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

Barriers.

BY THE REVEREND W. H. CAULDWELL, KETTERING.

'Who hath . . . broken down the middle wall of partition.'—Eph 2¹⁴.

If you go into the parks and open spaces of progressive towns and cities you will find very few restrictions such as 'Keep off the grass' or 'Don't' do this, or 'Don't' do that.

Sometimes these notices are phrased in a more polite way: 'Please keep to the footpath' or 'Please keep off the grass.'

However, more and more towns are doing away with such notices; in many places even the railings round the pleasure parks are coming down.

That may not seem very remarkable or new to you boys and girls because you have become used to this freedom. Some of you younger ones have known nothing else but open spaces free from restrictions. To those of us who are older this is a great step in the right direction. We remember the struggles it took to get the barriers removed.

When we went to the park there were railings round it, and on the grass were those commands or requests about 'Keeping off,' and there was the

park-keeper with his cane (and he knew how to use it), who struck terror into our hearts when we saw him coming our way. If we managed to escape him it would be weeks before we dare go near the park again.

Those things seem to have gone, or are quickly going, and for that we are thankful for your sakes.

But years and years ago when people said, 'Open the parks to the children, take down the railings and pull up the notices, let the children have freedom'—when people said that, other people replied, 'Why, if we allow people to walk where they like and do what they like we shall not have a flower left in the park. People will come and pick the flowers and walk off with the plants, and the children will trample on the beds.'

'Yes! Some people really believed that if the boys and girls were allowed to run about all over the park they would do injury to the beautiful things it contained.

In time one town tried the experiment to see what would happen. Fences were removed, notices were pulled up and taken to the potting-shed to be out of the way, the children ran about in perfect freedom and their laughter was a joy to hear.

But no one stole the flowers or did any of the terrible things some people said they would do. This town has two parks and you may walk anywhere without fear. There is a gold-fish pond in the middle of the rockery and the children do not fish in it.

There are, however, several notices about the parks but they have on them these words: 'Not Mine, not Thine, but Ours'—how different from the 'Keep off' kind! This notice is merely a gentle reminder to behave because the park belongs to all.

The world to-day seems to be made up of a number of old-fashioned parks each having barriers round it besides notices to 'Keep out.'

The park-keepers use guns and tanks and bombs to see that other people really 'Keep out.' And do you know that the people who own these parks—the nations—talk just as the people on the old Town Councils used to speak. When it is suggested that the nations should be free and open, friendly and trustful, and that barriers should be taken down, the world leaders say: 'What! take our barriers down; open our frontiers! What nonsense.' Why, as soon as we do that the other nations will come and steal our trade and trample over our land and steal our flowers.'

But, boys and girls, in years to come you will live to see how silly and wrong that kind of talk is, just as we know it was foolish to suggest that people

would despoil our parks once they were made free.

Jesus came to break down barriers between man and man. In His Kingdom there is to be no slave, no Jew or Greek, no male or female, but all are to be one with the same privileges under the reign of God's Fatherhood.

Now I want you boys and girls to follow in the footsteps of Jesus and live to break down barriers that separate nation from nation, and divide man from man. I want you to believe that the breaking of barriers is the beginning of friendship and love.

The only real way to break barriers is in the spirit of Love. The boys and the girls, the men and the women of the world must be one under the Kingship of Jesus and with Him build an everlasting Peace.

When you next sing:

'The whole wide world for Jesus'

think of the fences that must be pulled down before the wide world can be His, and determine that in His spirit of love you will play your part for His sake.

The Good Ship of the Gospel.

BY THE REVEREND R. G. KINNIS, KINCARDINE-ON-FORTH.

'And after three months we departed in a ship of Alexandria.'—Ac 28¹¹.

This summer there is a great stir in the city of Paris. Traders and merchants of all nations will be thronging its streets and walking round the stalls of the Great Exhibition to look at the products of many nations and see if there is anything worth buying. Not everything in the Exhibition, however, is for sale. The Protestant Church in France has seized with both hands this opportunity of doing some advertising on its own account. You know how much work a Church has to show to the world; its education, philanthropy, charity, missions, and publishing. What an interesting lot of stalls these will make! Yes, but the Church must remind people at the same time that all its labours are inspired by the gospel of Christ. Well, the French Protestants have conceived a very striking and original way in which to demonstrate this fact. They have so arranged their stalls that they are focussed on one point; all the avenues lead to a ship lying at one of the quays on the famous River Seine, which the people of Paris are also using for their Exhibition. This ship has been specially designed by a naval architect, and is made of teak and mahogany wood; so, you see, it is a

very valuable ship. Below her decks you will find a very quaint little church with a vaulted roof of timber shaped like a ship's cabin. There, tired people will go and get refreshed in body and soul; there, congregations will gather to worship and hear lectures. This ship bears the beautiful and most appropriate name: *La Belle Nouvelle*, 'The Good News.' This gospel ship reminds us of certain truths.

1. *The part ships have played in spreading the gospel.*—Paul did a lot of his travelling by ship. In the last two chapters of 'Acts' we read about his last voyage, when he was taken from Jerusalem to Rome. It was a great day when Paul set foot on Italian soil and took the road for Rome, for the very summit of his ambition was to preach the gospel there. In their Bulletin which describes their part in the Exhibition, the French Protestants tell us how the gospel first came to their land by sea, and then was carried up the River Rhone. How did Christianity come to our own land? Had not Augustine to cross the sea? Didn't Columba use a ship to get from Ireland to Scotland? Hundreds of years later, the Pilgrim Fathers sailed for America, taking the gospel and its freedom with them. The great missionaries of recent days have had to use ships: Paton sailed for the New Hebrides, and Livingstone for Africa. I like the story of the successors of Livingstone. Two Scotsmen went to London to get a special collapsible boat made to sail the African rivers. They only met with head-shaking until, as they emerged from one office, they ran into a young man, who asked them: 'Can I do anything for you, gentlemen?' They explained their need, and he promised to do his best. Soon he produced a suitable boat, and the expedition started; thus, the name of Alfred Yarrow, so honoured in British shipping history, is linked with Robert Laws, the veteran missionary.

2. *The Church is like a ship.*—The French Bulletin says that the well-being of the gospel seems to be in the keeping of a frail vessel like a canoe which is buffeted by the tempests and yet never sunk. That vessel is the Church, which is the Witness to the gospel and its Guardian among men. The first Christians perceived this likeness and called the part of the church where the congregation sits 'the nave,' which is from the Latin *navis*, 'a ship.'

Jesus Himself used boats—fishing-boats. He calmed the waves of the lake and spoke words of authority from a boat. For Jesus' sake Paul did what he did. For His sake Paton, Livingstone, and Laws did their part. What are you doing for

His sake? What is your place in the good ship of the gospel?

The Christian Year.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Harvest Thanksgiving Sermon.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc.,
KILLERMONT.

'He brought me to the banqueting house, and his banner over me was love.'—Ca 24.

The American novelist Frank Norris describes thus how wheat poured into the great Chicago market called the 'Pit,' and thwarted all attempts to hold up the price. 'The new harvest was coming in, huge beyond the possibility of control, like a tidal wave, bursting through, dashing barriers aside, rolling like a measureless river from the farms of Iowa and the ranches of California, on to the East, to the bakeshops and hungry mouths of Europe.' While no festival is more faithfully observed in country places than Harvest Thanksgiving, the world's harvest equally concerns the city worker. For, apart from some tribes of uncivilized huntsmen, all mankind depends on the labour of farmer and shepherd, on seed and soil and the order of Nature. In this region there can be no question, as in office or factory, of man claiming all the credit; for even while he sleeps the mysterious growth goes on; and when harvests ripen, it is after escaping perils of flood and storm and drought that human power could not have averted. Nothing might seem so fitted to unite men in reverence and thankfulness and praise as the perennial bounty of the harvest.

As he thought on these lines about his thanksgiving service it occurred to this minister that one very slack member of his congregation would be there. Though seeming to show no real interest in the gospel or the work of the Church this man had spoken in shocked tones a few days before about a neighbour who he said was an atheist, 'had no belief in a Maker,' he said. Ought one then, this preacher asked a friend, seeing that people of this careless type would be present whose religion was a sort of minimum bare belief in a Creator, to choose some simple text about God's power and liberality and avoid deeper themes.

The question was like a match to gunpowder. The answer came in an explosion of indignant protest. With passionate intensity his friend scorned the notion that the thoughts of a Christian congregation should be centred for even one service on corn and potatoes. Harvests, comforts, pleasures

these are all extras thrown in by the way. There is but one real subject for Christian praise—God's unspeakable gift in Jesus Christ. And because prose could not convey his feeling he turned to the poetry of the Song of Solomon, taking the music and passion of its language, not like a modern scholar as the speech of romantic human love, but as the old mystics and theologians did who fancied that they read beneath the surface or between the lines a spiritual sense, and used its words of devotion and gratitude and surrender to signify the love of the soul for its Redeemer. 'Here is a text for you,' he exclaimed.

"He brought me to the banqueting house,
And his banner over me was love."

Say that it is not the feast that counts, but the love with which it is spread. Preach not on the banquet, but on the banner, the banner of the Cross.'

Was he not right in the contention that it is useless to make worship broad and thin and vague in the hope of roping in people who care for nothing but harvests? A thanksgiving moved only by such gratitude is hardly worth while. The love of God is not a careless liking for people as they are so that He keeps them alive. It is a seeking, suffering love with a redeeming purpose in it. Harvests and every lavish gift of Nature come from One who has given far more. The right note to strike even at this festival is the high note of Christian adoration for the love of God for sinful men in Jesus Christ. Over the banqueting house hangs the banner of this love that cost Him dear.

First things first and always in God's worship. It is God's way. When the palsied man was brought to Jesus the first gift he got was pardon; then healing was added. The great climax of the Parable of the Prodigal Son is surely reached when his father fell on his neck and kissed him, though after that came the ring and the robe and the feast. The daily, yearly gifts of Providence are not looked upon rightly till they are seen as additions to the blessing of salvation. Masefield, in 'The Everlasting Mercy,' has described how everything looks different to a converted man. The 'golden harvest's yield' makes him think of the Bread of Life:

All earthly things that blessed morning
Were everlasting joy and warning.

'Preach, then, not on the banquet, but on the banner—the banner of the Cross.'

It is, however, inevitable and right to dwell at a thanksgiving service on the generosity of God's love, and the question a man of conscience will ask him-

self is how far in any human way open to him he follows the Divine example.

How to share the gifts of Providence has of course come to be a problem, perhaps *the* problem of statesmanship and world economics. If it is true that the world is suffering not from scarcity but from plenty, from the glut rather than the dearth of commodities, is there not both sin and folly in the situation? In a world containing millions of ill-nourished, scantily-clad, miserably-sheltered, poorly-paid people, science increases the yield of agriculture and man-production makes comforts cheap, and a wail goes up that prices are falling and that abundance means ruin. It seems queer and wrong, and indeed it is a commonplace to say that it is on the side of distribution, that is, of sharing, that civilization fails. If any one feels that these are matters beyond him let him consider what is in his personal control. Is there some lavishness like God's in his own charity?

Of Edgar Wallace, who had from his stories and plays the income of a millionaire and died bankrupt, having squandered it in luxury and gambling, some beautiful things are told among all the absurdities of his career. His wife describes his eagerness to share everything. His not particularly useful idea of charity was often to invite an enormous number of people to a banquet in a huge hotel. And then, she writes, 'he was always frightfully particular to see that the less important guests were having a good time. "After all," he would explain, "we don't have to worry about the stars. Everybody will be hanging round them. I want to be sure that the others are enjoying themselves." Edgar's philosophy had for its cornerstone loving-kindness.' Now one need not be a millionaire to be warmly charitable. 'Give alms,' said Jesus, 'of such things as ye have.'

A man may take God's large and lavish way in service. A sharp distinction used to be drawn between trades and professions. Though perhaps partly snobbish, the idea was this, that trade is based on weights and measures and money's worth and an exact bargain. But an artist, for example, would not paint a slightly more beautiful picture for ten pounds more. One buys with a lawyer's or a doctor's fee nothing exactly measurable, just his utmost skill and whole-hearted effort to do his best for the case. People speak of this professional standard being lowered to profit-making. One may also speak of raising the standard of every manner of life to the highest ideal of unstinted personal service. Every man may imitate the Divine pattern, giving generously all he can in faithful work, in personal

interest, adding something of goodwill and helpfulness and love at every turn.

And in that special connexion which comes at the beginning of his own relation to God, a man should ask himself if he is liberal and generous in forgiveness. 'Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you.' It is difficult to forgive at all, still harder to forgive freely and kindly so as to renew friendship and make life glad and sweet once more. It may be something stupid or malicious, or careless. Well, suppose it is! Had God's mercy been stated bluntly and baldly, that men were to be let off, not punished, even so men would have had to be grateful. But how much more He has added, the grace of His friendship, peace and joy, every blessing of this life and the hope of glory. Shall not the recollection of the lavishness of God rebuke man's unrelenting temper and inspire him to show in forgiveness of his fellows a generosity such as he has received?

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Quest for Health.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A.,
ABERDEEN.

'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.'—Jn 10¹⁰.

There is no quest more in evidence to-day than the quest for health. Certainly there is no more laudable quest, nor any with a greater following.

Health is of supreme importance. There are exceptional people, like Robert Louis Stevenson, who, despite a crippling infirmity, face life gallantly, answering all its demands without hesitation and with irreproachable exactitude. But, for the mass of us men and women, the condition of our health determines our attitude to life, makes us either happy or sad, careful in the execution of our duties or the reverse. Given health, most of us find life easily within the compass of our powers, its work a pleasure, while 'irritable' is the last word our friends would think of applying to us. Deprived of health, most of us are as different from our former selves as night is from day. The slightest duty is exacting; the most trifling worry makes clear thinking impossible; and to be courteous to our friends is sometimes quite beyond us. Realizing that, the majority of men and women have endeavoured to safeguard that upon which so much depends.

I. We may say with some assurance, I think, that there never was an age which set more store by

health than the age in which we live. Most of us are engaged in the quest, the statesman and his constituent, the teacher and his pupil, the doctor and the patient who invokes his aid.

One of our British statesmen, in a book entitled *Wanderings and Excursions*, describes the recreations in which he engages for the preservation of his health. The desire to get away from work that he may return to it again with greater zest constrains him, he says, 'to keep in his cupboard a friendly old suit of comfortable wear that has paled under the fervent eye of the sun, and been matured by dust and mud and rain, and with that, a pair of honest boots nailed like the oak door of an ancient keep which of themselves direct one's way o'er moor and fell and bog and bypath away from the offence and clamour of cars and trains.' It saves his soul, he says, it keeps his windows open to the winds of heaven and his heart to the song of the birds. And there are many in our day, like him, out upon the quest for health. Our roads are peopled as they have not been for years. Men and women are cycling, walking, running, touring—all in quest of health. Like the poet, many in our time would appear to hear a voice saying:

Away, away, from men and towns,
To the wild woods and the downs—
To the silent wilderness
Where the soul need not repress
Its music, lest it should not find
An echo in another's mind,
While the touch of Nature's art
Harmonizes heart to heart.

And, of course, all of us who are engaged in this quest are doing a great service for ourselves. No time we devote to it is ever wasted.

II. But I desire to go a little further. One cannot help wondering what attitude some have towards Jesus who are engaged in this quest for health. From their fitful attendance—if they attend at all—at the services of the Sanctuary, one cannot but deduce that they believe that Jesus and His religion have no point of contact with them. Religion seems solely concerned with obligations they are unwilling to acknowledge, and Jesus with a way of life lacking in attractiveness.

To decry those who assert a preference for the open is not my purpose. Nor have I a desire to criticise any for a failure to fulfil duties which, to my mind, may seem obligatory upon the entire human race. But I am concerned to show that Jesus has a very definite point of contact with us in our love of the open and in our quest for health, and

that He has a very definite contribution to make to your health and mine.

Poets and lovers of the open may sing of—

. . . wild woods and the plains
 . . . the pools where winter rains
 Image all their roof of leaves,

but their enthusiasm is infinitesimal beside that of Jesus, who glimpsed the beauty of the Galilean lilies, who watched with interest the farmer sowing his seed, who heard the song of the birds and whose heart sang with them. Men may insist upon the necessity of their withdrawing from workaday scenes and worries, but their insistence and even their practice lag far behind those of Jesus, who stole time from sleep to see the sun rise and gild the world with the beauty of a newborn morning. Many protest their sympathy with those to whom comes no hint of change, no opportunity to refresh themselves in the soft, fresh air of the open, unpolluted places; but our desire to help such is nothing beside that of Jesus, who found His chief task among men and women who were handicapped in the race of life and who, on that account, were unable to undertake the common duties of the common day. It was a supreme joy to Him to see men and women glorying in their health and taking everyday duties comfortably in their stride.

Jesus has no point of contact with those engaged in the quest for health. Nothing could be more untrue! From Him who enjoyed the open spaces and knew their recuperative qualities we have much to learn, and this among other things: that something more than fresh air is necessary sometimes for the restoration of health. It was not fresh air, or exercise, or recreation, that restored to the Woman of Samaria her zest for life, but contact with the radiant, health-giving personality of Jesus Christ. Nicodemus, he who came to Jesus by night, found life more than a little unintelligible, its duties more than a trifle exacting. He was unfit, was dissatisfied with his ideas about things, until he met Jesus, who put him on the way to health when He said, persuasively, 'Ye must be born again.' Peter was unfit because life held for him a peculiarly seductive temptation against which, he feared, his resources would be quite inadequate. 'I have prayed for thee,' said Jesus, thereby making His disciple strong in His strength. Are there not people, like the Woman of Samaria, Nicodemus, Peter, to-day who require something more than fresh air and exercise and recreation if they are to take their duties comfortably in their stride?

III. The contribution Jesus made to the health of men He makes still. He commends all who are seeking the refreshment of the open spaces, but He goes further. Because He does go further we may have reason to be glad. It may be that the contribution of Jesus is what some of us are needing.

Some, harassed by business, haunted by worry, pursued by memory, have sought healing in some quiet strath or glen. But, if we would be honest, there have been times when we have found the relaxation ineffectual, when we have returned to our task feeling as unequal to it as when we laid it down. Fresh air cannot do everything, nor can exercise, nor can recreation, we discover. Has it occurred to us that Jesus may have something pertinent to say to us as He had to men of His own day whose hands performed their tasks awkwardly and even unwillingly? Instead of seeking leafy lanes, or the green fields, or a quiet glen, we should do well to turn sometimes to Him who enjoyed such radiant health Himself and who longed to make others healthy.

It is His company the world needs to-day, the world which is emphasizing the importance of physical fitness. Will the fact that Russia, Germany, and other nations are concentrating upon raising a super-race mean the solution of all our international problems? The physical, let us recollect, is only one element in the matter of health. Physically sound men may be seriously unfit through the possession of false ideas. If unfit, then irritable. If irritable, then ready to take offence at the slightest indiscretion. The world needs Jesus if it is to be healthy.

If you and I and all who are crowding our roads to-day are as interested in the quest for health as declarations suggest, then we cannot ignore Him who came that we might have life. If the nations' testimony to their interest in health is sincere they must logically take Jesus and His utterances into their calculations. To make men healthy, equal to all life asks, was why He came.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Perfection of Love.

BY THE REVEREND C. G. WILKES, WIMBLEDON.

'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.' R.V. 'Ye therefore shall be perfect . . . '—Mt 5⁴⁸.

This is a command with something of a promise in it. It is a promise with something of a command in it. In either case a staggering saying! Perfection, human perfection, who can attain it?

Perfection, as the perfection of the Heavenly Father, who can essay it?

1. *What is the perfection here spoken of?* Not perfection of power. God makes His sun to shine on the evil and on the good. We have not the power to make the sun shine at all. He is not unreasonable and does not require from us that which He has set out of our reach. There are powers of body, mind, and spirit that we do not possess. He does not demand five talents where He has given but one. Some are slow of speech. Others are plagued with a poor memory, incoherency of thought, and the like. And though training can make some difference, yet there the disability is. Nor is the perfection here spoken of perfection of knowledge. There are many things we do not know: about God, about duties, about ideals, about the physical world, about human nature, about the training of children, about the use of money, about the cause and cure of poverty, about the interrelation of nations and colours, about the Bible, about our life here, about our life hereafter. With all this ignorance there is necessarily error. The error may be committed in good faith, but it is nevertheless error. Obviously this is not the kind of thing of which Jesus is speaking.

Christian perfection is the perfection of love. It is the perfection of loving deeds done to all and sundry. Just as God makes His sun to shine on the evil and on the good and sends rain on the just and on the unjust, so if any man compel us to go one mile we are to offer to go another; we are to love our neighbours and we are to love our enemies, and to pray for those that spitefully use us and persecute us.

That word 'therefore' in the text is important. It shows that the command is not to be taken away from what has gone before. Here Jesus is not even speaking of love to God, though He does that elsewhere. This is an emphasis on the second commandment. The first is one form of Christian perfection, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.' The second is, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Now in letting the emphasis in perfection rest upon conduct towards others, Jesus brings the doctrine down from heaven to earth. The usual objection felt to it is that it is all in the clouds. Far from it. It is very much upon earth as Jesus sees it. It is not a state of ecstasy in which we are caught up into the third heaven; but it is returning good for evil; treating enemies with goodness and the unlovable with loving deeds. So is the subject brought on to the level of everyday life.

You have known a woman who towards her little child showed the perfection of love. There was nothing too good for him. Her own interests were always secondary to his. She showed him the love which, as Paul says, is very patient, very kind, which knows no jealousy, makes no parade, is never selfish, never resentful. When the boy was fretful and cross and disobedient, he made his mother's life harder; but it did not alter by one jot her attitude of love towards him or thoughtful kindness. That is the perfection of love shown to one. Christian perfection is that love shown to all. For if we love our children only, what do we more than others? If we are kind to our own set and friends only, why, that is the way of the world. If we are generous to those who are generous to us, do not even quite disreputable folk act up to that?

2. *Is it possible?* Jesus' method of concrete examples makes perfection more understandable, but seemingly less attainable. It surely leaves us in no doubt that we have not attained. The answer to the question, 'Do we love the Lord our God with all our heart?' is found by looking within, and it is quite easily possible to make a mistake and to think that we do so love God without reserve when, as a matter of fact, it is not so. But no such mistake is possible about loving our neighbours and enemies. The facts are too painfully obvious to us to be overlooked—the facts of our self-interest and self-centredness, of our aloofness and our envies. We do not find perfection of love in our attitude to the unlikeable. Is it indeed possible? The question is forced on us. Can any man ever attain to it?

Now Jesus would scarcely command the impossible, or charge us to love our neighbour if no one could do it. And there is one word in the text which speaks of hope and promise: 'Father.' If the command had been 'Be ye perfect, as the Creator is perfect' it would have left us cold. If it had run 'perfect as your heavenly King' we should have found no encouragement. If it had been 'perfect as the eternal Judge' we might have trembled. But 'Father' is the word of grace here. For an attitude possible to Father may be possible to son. There is a likeness. We are made in His image. He is not requiring of us something alien to humanity, but something the germ of which is within us and is our inheritance. The beginnings of it are discernible in us. It is only its perfection which seems so far out of reach. The mother giving up ease and strength and holiday and perhaps life itself for her little one is acting just as God her Father is acting; the attitude is the same.

Yet a stronger hope comes in here. Where there is a father there is giving. But how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him! It is His desire to give us the gift of freedom from the sin of envy, jealousy, anger, irritability, meanness, selfishness. It is His desire to give us the gift of sweet temper, courage, truth, generosity, and purity. His giving is only conditioned by our desires and receptivity. An earthly father gives in accordance with capacity and desire. Where there is striving for a thing and desire for it, that can be given. The girl with music in her heart can be given a violin. The boy with mechanical bent can be given a chance to cultivate that side of his life. And the man who desires, and shows his desires by striving for them, can be given by his Heavenly Father purity and goodness and all the graces of the Christian character. He can become a real son, one who has caught the likeness of his Father. This likeness is a gift of God.

3. *Is it a long, long trail?* As long as life. For there never comes a time when no further progress can be made. A machine perfected may, bar wear and tear, be perfect a year later. It stays put. A human and living organism does not. The saint has still to progress. A year's non-progress is not only non-progress; it is decadence. He must grow in grace and in knowledge. And new knowledge means new opportunities and responsibilities and ideas of duty and living. So then let us ever be striving and ever ready to receive. For effort and trust are twin oars of this boat. The use of one without the other will merely send us round in a circle and will get us nowhere. Let us strive to show the attitude of our Father to our fellows. Let us strive with all our might. Yet nevertheless do we remember that it is after all the gift of God. Our effort does not obtain it; but it does make it possible for God to give it—even Godlikeness of loving-kindness to the good and the bad.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Consecration of Mind.

'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . with all thy mind.'—Lk 10³⁷.

No one cause accounts for the increasing estrangement of lay civilization from the Churches. But it is foolish to minimize the fact. Is not one of the most important causes of this failure the extent to which the Churches have overlooked the part played by reason in religion and forgotten that God is to be served not only with the soul and the heart but with the understanding?

And the Church, we may be sure, will remain a backwater as long as her official teaching includes beliefs which have been undermined by science and are in conflict with history; which survive as isolated and isolating forces in a world determined to live, to learn, and to advance to the full. As long as this is so, Christ's word to the Church is, 'One thing thou lackest.' 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind.'¹

A faith in which the mind plays no part is sure to end in folly. An unintelligent belief is in constant danger of being shattered. Hardy, in sketching the character of Alec D'Urberville, explains the eclipse of his faith by saying, 'Reason had had nothing to do with his conversion, and the drop of logic that Tess had let fall into the sea of his enthusiasm served to chill its effervescence to stagnation.'

But there is another danger. It is confining the mind within carefully restricted limits. There are those who use their brains busily in their religion, but outside certain limits their faith is an unreasonable assumption. Their mental activity spends itself on the details of doctrine, while they never try to make clear to themselves the foundations of their faith. They have keen eyes for theological niceties, but wear orthodox blinders that shut out all disturbing facts. Cardinal Newman, for example, declared that dogma was the essential ingredient of his faith, and that religion as a mere sentiment is a dream and a mockery. But he was so afraid of 'the all-corroding, all-dissolving scepticism of the intellect in religious inquiries' that he placed the safeguard of faith in 'a right state of heart,' and refused to trust his mind to think its way through to God. Martineau justly complained that 'his certainties are on the surface, and his uncertainties below.' We are safe as believers only when, besides keeping the heart clean, we

press bold to the tether's end
Allotted to this life's intelligence.²

'When the procession of your powers goes up joyfully singing to worship in the temple, do not leave the noblest of them all behind to cook the dinner and to tend the house,' said Phillips Brooks. 'Insist on seeing all that you can see now through the glass darkly, so that hereafter you may be ready when the time for seeing face to face shall come.' And again he said, 'The being who has intellect does not love perfectly unless his intellect takes part in his loving.'

Dr. Lang when Archbishop of York, speaking to a

¹ A. Fawkes, *The Church a Necessary Evil*, 74.

² H. S. Coffin, *Some Christian Convictions*, 29.

Student Christian Movement Conference at Liverpool, urged that in all dedication of the mind sincerity was the first requirement. Even a loyal disciple of Christ, he said, has to pass through searching discipline if he is also to be loyal to truth. Do not shirk that risk, great and awful as it is. In days of bewilderment, be quite relentless in the maintenance of your intellectual integrity; follow the argument where it leads. But all the time maintain also your religious practice, your prayers, your Bible reading, your meditation, your communion. The light you need to solve your problem may come through them. Never let them go unless or until it would seem to be sheer hypocrisy to persist in them, which can only be if you really become convinced that your religious faith is baseless. But even the risk of that must be faced in our loyalty to truth. We must solemnly recognize that loss of faith may be the price that has to be paid for the ultimate winning of deeper truth, just as the sense of dereliction by God was part of what Christ must pass through to win the joy that was set before Him, the joy of a world by Him redeemed from selfishness to love.

'In understanding be men,' said St. Paul to the Christians at Corinth, and he enjoins upon the brethren at Philippi to 'think on these things.' To many who are conscious of the poverty of their intellectual endowment and the slenderness of their educational opportunities this seems a counsel of perfection. But one of the outstanding marks of true Christianity is its power to confer upon commonplace and poorly-educated folk the distinction of a lofty spiritual intelligence. One may meet, not only in lonely glens but along the crowded highways, humble working folk who, in plain and homely speech, discourse upon the things of the Spirit with a grip and a discernment which are at once a delight and a rebuke. Without knowing it, they have by slow and patient pondering attained to a degree of mental concentration and penetrative insight, and developed a clarity of spiritual perception which many a highly-educated man might envy.

'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy will, and with all thy mind.' Thought is not a cold and rigid exercise of the mind, demanding the suppression of all emotion and calling for a loveless neutrality. Sympathy, not indifference, is the true key to knowledge, and one cannot even study a primer of geology rightly without bringing some degree of sensitiveness and fervour

of spirit to the subject. We cannot separate thought from either the will or the emotions, for the soul of man is a unity. It never merely understands, or wills, or feels. In every act of understanding there are the potential dynamic of will and the latent flame of emotion. And where that understanding is exercised upon the things of God, there the will begins to energize towards the Divine and love bursts into flame.

There is an intimate connexion between thought and prayer. The mind feeds the heart, and an understanding irradiated with Divine wisdom is often the only thing needed to redeem our prayer-life from dullness and impotence. The prayers of the unthinking soul always tend to resolve themselves into a narrow cycle of petitions, bounded by individual need and lacking intelligent sympathy with God's larger plans and purposes. Such prayers carry the seeds of decline within themselves, and, however fervently begun, tend to become cold and perfunctory and to make the devotional life childish and trivial. To refuse the intellectual discipline that comes by pondering deeply upon spiritual verities implies, not merely a culpable laziness, but more often a cowardice which shrinks from 'thinking through' the deeper implications of the gospel, lest the life which passed muster on a superficial, childish view of things should stand condemned.

One true, deep thought of God, experimentally appropriated and worked out by Christian men and women, would change the face of England. 'Think, learn to think!' exclaims a shrewd observer. 'It will profit you—there is so little competition!' And from the heart of God there still wells up the moving plaint: 'My people doth not *consider*'!

Thought is the fuel of the soul's fire. Madame Duclaux tells us how one night, when Pascal was lying seriously ill and unable to sleep, as he read the Gospel of St. John a flame of fire seemed to envelop him. 'In the incomparable phrase of the *Imitation*, he was "all on fire," and with the Psalmist he cried: "While I was musing, the fire burned," a flame of mysterious, beneficent fire that inundated heart and flesh and spirit with a new sense.'

Conscious of coldness and impotence, we long for the experience of some great creative moment such as comes ever and anon to the saints of God. Our need calls for such a vivifying experience. It will surely come if, having yielded our will and affections to God, we also bring our mind to His searching and fructifying discipline.¹

¹ E. Herman, *The Touch of God*, 31.

Contributions and Comments.

How Satan came into the World.

To begin with: not 'Satan' as pictured in the later folklore of Jews and non-Jews, the horny and hooved Satan who chastises and tortures the sinners in hell. All this is a later conception that does not appear anywhere in the Bible, where the name Satan occurs for the first time. Nor, as is known, is the 'Gehinnom' of the Bible the same as conceived of later—the 'Hell,' the Gehennah of the Arabs, but the valley Ben-Hinnom, the known valley near Jerusalem, called so after a person of that name. It was Jeremiah's prophecy that this valley would one day become the Valley of Slaughter and a burial-place that gave rise to the later conception of the Gehinnom as a place of torment for the wicked.

Satan plays a different rôle in the Bible, where he appears in various places as provocator and obstructor. The Greeks translated the Hebrew word 'Satan': 'Diaboles,' *i.e.* slanderer. This Greek word developed in modern languages into devil, Teufel, diable, djabel, etc. In my German translation of the Bible I attempted to render this conception by a wider term: *Der Widergeist*, the 'Opposing Spirit,' which is, as was felt by Goethe, 'The Ever-negating Spirit.' But by this nothing yet is said on the origin of this conception and the word.

We can learn more on this subject by examining the main place in the Bible where Satan appears, in the prologue to the Book of Job 1⁶⁻¹² (compare also 2¹⁻⁷).

The scene before God is pictured here as the appearance before a king. The Lord sits on His throne as a king, and all members of His court present themselves to stand before Him and to serve Him. The prophets also vision God as a king sitting on his throne. So does Isaiah in his prophecy (ch. 6), and so does Micaiah the son of Imlah in 1 K 22¹⁹: 'I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left.'

The same picture of the appearance before God as before a king is at the basis of the prophecy in Zec 4. The meaning of this chapter becomes clear if—in agreement with other scholars—we leave out for our purpose the passage from the second part of v.⁶ to the second part of v.¹⁰ ('This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, saying . . . and shall see the plummet in the hand of Zerubbabel.') This passage relates the 'sayings of the Lord to Zerub-

babel' and not the revelation of the prophet; and thus the meaning of the prophecy itself appears as one clear idea.

What the prophet symbolizes in his prophecy is the presence before the Lord as before a king. God himself is symbolized by the candlestick. Its seven candles are the 'eyes' of the Lord who 'rove' (*meshotetim*) through the whole 'earth' to inform Him of the political standing of His subjects and of their attitude towards Him. These are not eyes proper, but the Lord's confidants who, according to Herodotus, were called, especially in the Persians' reign, 'the eyes of the king.' Hence they are spoken of in the text in the masculine *meshotetim* (roving), as the reference is not to roving eyes (eyes is feminine in Hebrew), but to roving persons. But also in 2 Ch 16⁹—'for the eyes of the Lord rove through the whole earth'—the reference is to those secret messengers.

Besides these roving messengers, who present themselves before the Lord to inform him of what they have seen on earth, there appear in Zec 4 'the two sons of Yitzhar, who stand by the Lord of the whole earth.' It is evident that the name 'sons of Yitzhar' also represent officials whose nature is not yet known to us, perhaps a name for two guards who stand on the right and left hand of the Lord.

We thus see that there is great similarity between the description of the appearance before the Lord in Zechariah and in Job. In the latter, too, some beings appear before the Lord, who is apparently pictured here also as sitting on His throne. These beings who present themselves before the Lord are referred to here as godly beings, literally 'sons of gods.' In other places in the Bible this expression means all kinds of godly beings. Here, however, it apparently stands for an ancient name of officials corresponding to the expression in Zechariah: 'the sons of Yitzhar who stand by the Lord of the whole earth.' And instead of the 'king's eyes' who 'rove' (*meshotetim*) through the whole earth and who render account of the deeds of men, here appears 'Satan' who comes 'from roving' (*mishshut*) in the earth, and from walking in it.' There is no doubt that the original Hebrew name of this 'rover' was not Satan with an S, but—as these letters can also be pronounced—*Ha-shatan* with a Sh, namely, 'the rover.'

And it now becomes clear that this is really the original meaning of the concept Satan. In Job this is quite evident. Now we can understand the

question and answer. The Shatan is the Lord's eye who goes to and fro in the earth and gives account of the political loyalty of the Lord's subjects. Hence the question 'Whence comest thou?' and the answer 'From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it,' *i.e.* from fulfilling my duty. And hence the further question: And among those you have inspected, have you done so particularly with regard to this or that one of my subjects? Is my subject Job really as loyal as I have been considering him until now?

Under the impression of all the various appearances of Satan as an accuser, opposer, and obstructor, his words that he comes from roving (*mishshut*) in the earth have been considered as a kind of pun only. Herein lies, however, the key to the original conception. If the presence in the Lord's court of a special spirit whose task it is to accuse and slander, thereby placing obstacles in the way of God Himself, could hitherto not be explained, it now becomes clear, that as before the throne of every earthly king, rovers (*Shatanim* with Sh) who go to and fro to report on the deeds of the Lord's subjects, stand by His throne. It is also understood now why Satan does not appear at the end of the story of Job to be punished for his false accusation. Satan as a political officer has merely fulfilled his duty, which is to report on every one of the Lord's subjects who might perhaps harbour revolt. The 'rover' must warn the king against all his subjects, even against those who appear to be most loyal. And it becomes clear, how both the linguistic forms of the word and the different ideas about Satan could develop out of this original conception.

As to philology, it is known that in the Hebrew language and in the Semitic languages generally, the pronunciation of Sh and S interchanged, as for example in the story in Jg 12 about Ephraimites who could not pronounce the Sh in the word Shibboleth; the same is true of the inter-changing relation between these sounds in Arabic and Hebrew, so that instead of Sh in Hebrew S is used in Arabic, and *vice versa*. It is then possible that what was pronounced in one dialect Shatan, with Sh, was pronounced in another dialect Satan, with S. The ending—*an*—is not common in the ancient Hebrew of the Bible, it therefore means that this word, the original form of which in the old Hebrew would be Shaton, came once more into this language from one of the cognate dialects, such roving *Shatanim*, 'messengers,' undoubtedly, served at the courts of all the kings in the ancient East. In the same way, for example, the Hebrew word *Pshr*—to interpret—came once more back into Hebrew in the Aramaic

form *Ptr*, especially for the interpretation of riddles and dreams. Such development can also be traced regarding the word *Sheger*, 'lie,' the origin of which is the word *Seget* with S common to all Semitic languages, and meaning 'red paint,' 'rouge.' But whoever puts rouge—*Seget* with S—on his pale face in order to appear more beautiful or healthier, in fact deceives and lies. Thus the new word *Sheger* with Sh meaning 'lie' was evolved in Hebrew and Aramaic from one of the dialects.

In Arabic the word Satan became *Shaytan*. The *yod* of the first syllable (*Shaytan*) shows they felt that the root of the word was *Shwt* or *Shyl*, not *Stn*, and that 'an' is only the ending of the word and does not form part of its root. On the other hand, we can understand that Shatan's official work of accusing brought about the formation of a new verb, *Sim*, which is derived from the noun and means to accuse and oppose. From this verb, noun-forms were further developed, as, for example, *Sitnah*, 'accusation.' In Arabic, too, a new verb *Shaytan*—whose meaning corresponds to the Hebrew verb *Stn*—was likewise developed from the borrowed noun *Shaytan*. However, a similar meaning was also derived from the original verb 'shut' from which *Shatan*, 'Satan,' is derived. For this must, apparently, be the explanation of the fact that the same verb 'shut' also means in both Aramaic and Hebrew 'to despise.' The activity of Satan, the rover, and his information were actually making the person about whom he spoke despised before the Lord. What the roving Satan had to say was not in favour of the persons he spoke about. As a secret officer who had to take care of the interests of government, he was really the accuser and prosecutor. In the eyes of the people (and often actually so) he was Diabolos, the accuser, the slanderer. Satan thus really represents everything harmful and obstructive. When Balaam sets out on his way, 'the angel of the Lord stood in the way as a Satan against him,' as a policeman who prohibits one to go this or that way. This secret officer, who was the first to bring before the king the information on His subjects' transgressions, stands at the accused's right hand 'to accuse him.' In case such a roving Satan does not find fault with man, or with the whole nation, so that he has nothing to communicate to his master whereby to prove his diligence and efficiency, he even assumes the rôle of provocator who tempts people to sin in order to turn them over afterwards to judgment: 'And a Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel.' In short, the origin of Satan as a

secret police agent clearly explains his later development.

In our passage in Job, the rover says in parallel words that 'he comes from roving in the earth, and from walking in it.' It is probable that the corresponding word *Mihallech*, 'walking,' had a development similar to that of the word Satan. In Accadian, the language of the Assyrians and Babylonians, which is very nearly related to Hebrew, the same term *muttaliku*, the 'walker,' is used in several ways. It is the attribute of the 'evil eye' which travels about to harm people and in the expression 'the street walker' it denotes especially two demons, a male and a female demon. Is it that the idea of a secret officer, the evil angel of God, can already be found at the basis of this conception of

the male and female demon who travels about? In the Bible, too, the 'walker' or 'traveller' is spoken of as an official: Pr 6¹¹ and 24³⁴, 'So shall thy poverty come as one that travelleth.' 'The one that travelleth' is generally considered to be the warrior. Is it not more correct, however, to see in this term the roving police officer and not the warrior generally?

Satan came to this world as a secret political officer who does his duty, imposed upon him by His Lord. It was only later development that turned Satan into the opposing spirit that does not act as ordered by the Lord, but creates evil in opposition to His will.

HARRY TORCZYNER.

Hebrew University,
Jerusalem.

Entre Nous.

The Second World Conference on Faith and Order.

The thought that the world has become a closer and more organic unity through ease and rapidity of communication has been so often expressed as to be a commonplace, but it has received a fresh interpretation and a deeper significance through the meetings of the Second Conference on Faith and Order, held in Edinburgh in the early days of August.

The danger of such a Conference is that what it gains in breadth, it may lose in depth, and that discussions should become so general, and so excessively considerate, as to be more theoretical than practical. But we think that danger was almost altogether avoided. There was a note of deep seriousness, a clear awareness of the difficulties to be overcome, an acute consciousness of the need of the world, with a fresh realization of the power of the gospel of Christ to meet that need; above all, a determination to treat the obstacles to unity as obstacles and not as barriers; and, finally, a resolve that, if possible, a message should go forth to the Churches which would enlighten their peoples, and spread amongst their ecclesiastical leaders the contagion of an unquiet conscience.

The need of the world 'of a society which has lost its moorings' was indeed felt most urgently, and

was perhaps most poignantly expressed in the appeal of the Bishop of Dornakal, a representative of the Younger Churches. 'We want you,' he said, 'to take us seriously when we say that the problem of union is one of life and death with us. Do not—we plead with you—do not give us your aid to keep us separate, but lead us to union.'

But the need of the world may be vividly realized, and yet all that may arise out of this may be a discussion of plans which are born of merely human wisdom. A deeper note than this was struck at the very beginning of the Conference. The emphasis was laid not so much upon the need as upon the sufficiency of the gospel to meet it. 'The heart of the Christian message,' said Dr. Leiper, 'is not merely relevant to the need of the world, but is that which alone can help and heal'—heal a world which is crying out for brotherhood and community, if only the Churches would remember effectively that 'a divided Church is a caricature of the gospel.' The same idea was stressed over and over again by the Archbishop of York, especially in his deeply impressive opening sermon in St. Giles'. For him, the unity of the Church is already existent, a gift of God to the world, in the heart of Christ and mediated by the Holy Spirit. 'The unity of the Church of God is a perpetual fact, our task is not to create it, but to exhibit it. . . . The Christian faith

and life are not a discovery or invention of men, they are not an emergent phase of the historical process, they are the gift of God.'

This emphasis upon the objectivity of the Christian message was the dominant idea in the opening days of the Conference. Perhaps it is permissible to trace in this the influence—the better influence—of a current tendency in theology, a more healthful aspect of that aversion to humanism which is characteristic of much thinking at the present day. But be that as it may, the question immediately arises about the form of the expression in the past and the present of this objective fact of the coming of Christ to the world of space and time. How is the mystical Church, hid in the heart of God and become incarnate in Christ, to embody itself? Is the institutional Church to be regarded as a close approximation to, and adequate embodiment of, the mystical Church? One of the most interesting aspects of the expression of opinion in the Conference was the absence of rigidity in this matter on the part of even the representatives of the Orthodox Church. They seemed prepared to introduce a certain judgment of value, to allow of the constant superiority of the mystical Church to any institutional form of expression. Whenever such value-judgment is permitted even in the slightest degree, there are immediately grounds for hope that forms which keep Churches apart may not be regarded as sacrosanct for all time, but may be considered as modes of the expression of the purpose of God which are moving onward to ever greater adequacy and comprehensiveness. It all comes back to our conception of God and His working in the world. Is His revelation static or dynamic? Has the spirit of the Christ, the Son of God, been revealed only in the past, or are we still under His divine guidance? The suggestion was made that there was hope of a solution in a combination of objectivity and subjectivity, in Barthianism modified by Bergsonianism, or, more generally, in a humanism purified and redeemed by a stronger emphasis upon the fundamental implications of the Incarnation of Christ. The controversy is always breaking out anew between the 'institutional' and the 'gathered' Churches, between those which emphasize tradition and those which lay stress on voluntary association at the present time. But may it not be that God's revelation is *both* objective and subjective, both institutional and also—just as importantly—in the current collective aspirations of men? God is not without a witness in any age, even in this present age. There can be no sheer humanism in a world which the com-

ing of Christ has made sacramental. The transcendent and the immanent are reconciled in the Incarnation of Christ, and the cause of Church unity may be helped forward by a fuller appreciation of this conception.

It seemed to be a general opinion at the Conference that a mere federation of Churches was not the goal to be aimed at. The Bishop of Dornakal made an earnest plea for organic union as the only ideal which was worthy of our prayers and sacrifices, and could prove to the world the reality and power of the Christian faith—'one visible Church, possessing a common life, a common ministry, and common sacraments.' The possibility of this is the crux of the whole situation. Is it reasonable or even logical that men should confess that we are divided simply because we are not wholly possessed by the spirit of Christ, and at the same time feel that they are constrained to 'maintain barriers against completeness of union at the Table of the Lord.' Is there any justification for placing inter-communion far away as the goal of progress towards union instead of regarding it as the primary manifestation of the spirit which makes the desire for union possible? The Archbishop of York stated his position at the beginning of the Conference in a manner which must command the deepest respect even if we cannot agree to the necessity of the position itself. The words quoted above are from his opening sermon, and he continues, 'I believe from my heart that we of that tradition [the tradition of the Churches which maintain barriers] are trustees for an element of truth concerning the nature of the Church which requires that exclusiveness as a consequence, until this element of truth be incorporated with others into a fuller and worthier conception of the Church than any of us hold to-day.' Yet he describes this division as 'the greatest of all scandals in the face of the world,' and he holds that only if it is a source to us of spiritual pain can those who maintain the exclusiveness be absolved from 'the guilt of unfaithfulness to the unity of the gospel and of God Himself.' No one present at the Conference could question the absolute sincerity with which Dr. Temple expressed this conviction, but at the same time we may perhaps ask whether the position is altogether a consistent one. If, as the Archbishop suggests, we ought all of us to reach forward to a fuller and worthier conception of the Church than we at present possess, and if the sacrament of Holy Communion has that central importance in the objective expression of the Holy Spirit which is the Church, surely mutual participation in Holy

Communion would be one of the most powerful factors in helping us to arrive at the fuller conception of the Church which we so earnestly desire. Is the attitude taken up not a little like inviting us to enter a door and yet withholding from us the key of the door?

Further, if the exclusiveness is wrong, if it is a scandal 'in the face of the world'—to use the Archbishop's own language—then ought we not to put the matter right without delay? The spiritual pain which is felt by those who feel constrained to exclusiveness cannot justify indefinite postponement if postponement is wrong. A subjective emotion cannot justify an objective wrong.

We cannot have the matter both ways; the exclusiveness is right or it is wrong. If it is right, then surely it is a mistake to feel spiritual pain in regard to it. If it is wrong, then surely abandonment of it is a first form of obligatory activity rather than an ultimate goal.

But it may be said that this is an over-simplification of a complicated situation, and perhaps it is, otherwise there would not be so much hesitancy on the part of sincere advocates of unity, including the Archbishop himself. But still we think that the members of the Anglican Episcopate who attended the Communion Service in St. Giles', held under Church of Scotland auspices, did very much by their example to help forward practically the cause of unity.

If we are called upon to save a person from drowning, and can do it because we possess the power of swimming vigorously, no amount of subjective regret can excuse us if we delay our efforts. If as a Church we are called to save the world from perishing, and can do it through the presentation of the gospel in an undivided Church, possessing the gift of God, no amount of spiritual pain will justify delay. There is still truth in the Kantian principle that 'ought' implies 'can,' and perhaps the reversed form of the statement is also true for the Christian Church that 'can' implies 'ought.' May we be saved from dependence upon an indefinite future, and remember that eternity is even now in time, that the eternal love of God in Christ is a present gift and not merely a future possibility!

W. S. URQUHART.

Torphins.

A Confederacy of the Churches.

Another contribution has been received on this great question of the reunion of the Churches—a

question so much in our minds at present. The writer has been turning over in his mind the Archbishop of York's remark that the division between the Churches is 'the greatest of all scandals in the face of the world,' and he has also been reading the new edition of *Towards Reunion: What the Churches Stand For* (S.C.M.; 1s. net), a volume edited by Mr. Hugh Martin and in which six well-known and representative men—Dr. S. C. Carpenter, Dr. Townley Lord, Dr. W. D. Niven, Dr. H. G. Wood, Mr. B. L. Manning, and Professor Victor Murray—state what their Churches 'stand for.'

This is what our contributor says: One of the commonest things we hear from insiders and outsiders alike is that the divisions of the Churches are a 'scandal.' But are they? We do not say that unity is undesirable, but we do say that uniformity is. Two things may be said in justification of the variety of Christian denominations. We are different, and think differently. And therefore one man's mind leads him to prefer one form of Church polity, and his neighbour prefers another. And so some men prefer episcopacy, others a presbyterian form, others an individualist form. Where is the scandal in this?

Besides, nationality, history, and environment, and even climate, have something to do with deciding the preponderant tendency of people towards one or other form of Church government. It is equally difficult to suppose that we can reach agreement in the matter of belief. The real scandal of our divisions is different. First of all, it is often to be found in the attitude of Churches to one another, and, as has been said, an undogmatic Christianity is a contradiction in terms, and is the real source of a feeling of bitterness which dispels all prospect of unity.

But further, there is the 'shameful waste of men and money,' which is perpetuated by divisions which exist without any counterbalancing co-operation. Every one can point to parishes where there are three or four or more Christian Churches in a community which would be amply served by one. The three or four are all struggling along with insufficient means, with ministers whose souls are seared by the discouraging conditions and the unholy competition. And there are new housing areas all over the land with clamant needs of men and money which are being squandered in districts that have no need of them. How can the Church hold its ground when its resources are frittered away in unnecessary enterprises?

But there is a third charge which is made against

the Church by outsiders which is regarded by many thoughtful and not unsympathetic people as a real scandal. It is the apparent inability of church people to value at their real worth the big things that should unite them, and the other things which at the best are secondary. The outsider says frankly, 'Why should I join a Church when the Churches don't seem to feel the greatness of the truth they preach enough to let them work together for the welfare of society?' He often puts it much more strongly, and most unfairly, when he says, 'Why should I come into a Church where they are all squabbling about matters that don't seem to me to matter?' The real criticism here, and it is a valid one, is that the Churches do not make sufficient of the great unifying truths of the gospel to lead them to co-operate closely in their divine task. After all, we have a gospel. Why does it not bring us together at least in fellowship and service?

Well, what of the future? What are the great conferences going to do for us? There are two things on which we may fix our minds with some optimism. One is the growing desire to at least understand one another.

The other hope is surely in the coming of a confederacy or council of the Churches which will preserve their real and justifiable differences, emphasize their real oneness and secure their active and effective co-operation in the service of mankind. It is essential that the Churches should realize, assert, and embody their real unity. Why, therefore, should there not be a great body which will include all the non-Roman Churches in the world, which will give a definite witness to the world, which will cordially recognize the place and worth and standing of each of its component parts, which will exert a powerful influence on national and international questions, which will realize Christ's prayer 'that they all may be one,' and show to the world that we are one, which will set forth the Big Things of the Christian faith and life as the one essential matter for all the Churches?

Harvest.

'To-day I went to church unintentionally, by which I mean that I put aside the church-going clothes when I got up, and put on the others intending not to go. Then after breakfast I changed my mind, though not my clothes, and went and enjoyed it. It was harvest thanksgiving: the church was decorated with chrysanthemums and oats, and an occasional beetroot or carrot; and we

had four harvest hymns. Do you remember the touching simplicity of harvest hymns? They make me wriggle and purr with enjoyment:

And keep us in His grace,
And guide us when perplexed,
And save us from all ills
In this world and the next.

The simplicity gave me such a *douce attandrissement* that I felt as if I could kiss the whole choir for singing it. But they missed out one verse of 'We plough the fields and scatter,' and I nearly made a fuss and interrupted the service then. We had, too, the 118th Psalm and a fine chant for it: do you know that psalm? It is splendid and buoyant and says things two or three or four times over because it is so glad.¹

Hymn Society.

A Society has been formed for the study of hymns. The Hon. President is the Archbishop of York, and the Hon. Secretaries are the Rev. G. Currie Martin, M.A., B.D., and the Rev. F. Sander-son, M.A. Any one interested can obtain full particulars from the Secretaries (30 Ambrose Avenue, London, N.W.11). The membership fee is 2s. 6d.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, 1937-1938.

Varied articles are being arranged for the next months. One series will deal with aspects of Worship, covering The Basis of Worship, The Ordering of Worship, Worship and Sacraments, The Place of the Sermon in Worship, Fellowship in Worship, Worship and Service.

A number of recent social experiments will be described under the general title of 'Christianity in Action.' Expository articles—'Great Texts Retranslated'—will consist of studies based on modern translations. Amongst important single articles we shall publish in October 'The Basic Forms of Theological Thought,' by Professor Karl Barth.

¹ G. M. Trevelyan, *Grey of Fallodon*, 156.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.